THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3 SEPTEMBER Vol. XLIV

THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN

By The Editor

THE thirty-seventh Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen was held at Westfield College, Hampstead, September 6—10, 1954.

Although London is not so popular a centre for our Conferences as is Oxford or Cambridge, the attendance was good and the discussions admirable. The papers were remarkable for their variety and range of interest. The majority of them were contributed by laymen possessed of outstanding qualifications who adequately fulfilled the threefold query of: 'Who said it? How did he say it? What did he say?'

The theme selected for the consideration of the Conference was entitled *Christian Living in Modern Society*. Under this comprehensive title an arresting and practical collection of crucial issues was effectively presented.

In this issue of the *Modern Churchman* we publish the ten Conference papers together with the Presidential address by Sir Henry Self and the Conference sermon by Canon Fallows.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

CHRISTIAN LIVING IN MODERN SOCIETY

By Sir Henry Self, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., K.B.E., B.D., M.Sc.

I. Introductory

THIS year's Conference is directed towards a new field. Heretofore we have been mainly concerned with themes primarily of a theological character or directed to Church problems as such, with wider issues coming in rather as side matters. This year the Conference Committee have designedly directed our eyes towards the sociological field because of its special importance at this particular setting in human history and having regard to the rapid march of events during the present century. This does not, of course, imply any intention of weakened interest in the basic objects of the Union in so far as they relate to theological and doctrinal matters. The Union has long come to be regarded as the guardian of the freedom of thought and of theological research as a necessary assurance of a living faith. We must, and surely always will, be constantly vigilant in these matters, but the doctrinal issues have been reasonably resolved by the Report of the Doctrinal Commission appointed by the two Archbishops : with this background the time has arrived when we should seek to make a constructive contribution to the re-establishment of the Christian faith, whilst at the same time ensuring that there is no retrogression from the standards prescribed in the Doctrinal Commission's Report. In short, it is reasonable to hold that the M.C.U. has brought achievement in this particular area and should pass to constructive work for the future. But this constructive work is again not only doctrinal — it must also address itself to the wider issues pressing so heavily upon the times. This in itself is a necessary corollary to the emphasis placed by the Union on the urgent need for reconstructing the Christian faith in form and practice adequate to the needs of this century. Time for such a presentation is very much overdue, but it will be ineffective unless matched by constructive work on sociological principles which provide the essential complement to the doctrinal presentation. Only so can we find a living faith capable of holding the world to its spiritual basis in a situation of mounting tension which threatens in many ways to slip irretrievably beyond the possibility of recovery. If once the religious strands of humanity are slipped, the outcome must be disastrous : it can only be maintained by presentation of a living faith and its witness, both in the individual life and in the life of society.

This thought must be much in our minds when we come to the critical theme of this year's Conference, which is 'Christian Living in Modern Society'. The series of papers which will be presented to you is directed towards setting forth and meeting the challenge which faces the Church. This is a vast field of interest and pressing importance. That is why the Conference Committee have selected this theme, despite the view held in certain quarters that the Union should not concern itself with such issues. Surely this must be a wrong attitude in the world situation of to-day? The doctrinal issues have been resolved and we are faced with a sea of difficulties and problems in the sociological field. It is our clear duty to focus our outlook in this as in the more erudite regions of doctrinal controversy. I may perhaps be allowed to illustrate my theme by a brief glance at some of these difficulties.

II. The Conception of the Welfare State

I do not propose to go into the basic issues of the welfare state as such. Its virtues so clearly outweigh its vices that everybody welcomes it, but that is not to say that we should not be on our guard against some aspects of its development which are contributory to the present difficulties. For example, 'planning' is a necessary essential and rightly pursued in the welfare state. In the present condition of world national economy it would be impracticable to have an ordered society with full employment and a right standard of living without this planning. But the fact remains that a planning policy tends to produce a 'spoonfed population'. It brings in a tendency to view life through rosy spectacles — at any rate, for the majority of people who leave the mysteries of planning to the experts much in the same way as they leave the mysteries of economics, disease and law to the economists, doctors and lawyers. In so doing, they assume that they will always have a well-ordered state with a healthy economy, full employment and social security, just as they assume that the doctor will always be able to keep them well and the lawyer protect their rights, however much they may be challenged by others. There is thus a strong tendency towards easy living and the parallel, yet misguided, assertion of individual rights to maximum benefits. Rights connote duties, but the duties are not stressed with equal voice to that given to the demand for man's supposed 'natural rights'. There is inevitably a lack of proper understanding of personal responsibility in the individual life and within society.

It is probably true to say that overall planning for the lives of all within an ordered society must tend to level downwards to a common average. In addition to the struggle as between the rights

and duties, there is thus a clear tendency for individual enterprise to be curtailed. But human nature has long roots stemming back into animal ancestry over long vistas of time : during those millions of years man has acquired natural instincts of individual competition, of struggle against difficulties, of triumph over hardship — all these qualities are innate to man and cannot be ignored without serious risk of undermining society. We must seeks ways and means, within the welfare state, to preserve adventurous living, creative enterprise in the walks of life and the assurance of sufficient adventure to preserve that natural instinct of achievement against difficulty. It is paradoxical to say that frustration is a necessary element of life, but that is so. On the other hand, undue frustration must lead to psychological disaster of another sort. It is here, as with vitamins in biochemistry — either a shortage or an excess will produce adverse results. There has to be a happy mean — so it is with frustration. I think it is one of the weak features of modern society that it overlooks the fundamental character of this need.

There is another aspect of it, too. That is, education has got to match the full employment and the security and health which the welfare state offers. By education, I do not mean simply raising the school leaving age and forcing a lot of so-called fact into the resisting craniums of individuals who probably would be better trained outside school than in it. What I have in mind is the problem of adult education in all its forms. Not necessarily education of an intellectual character, but certainly education in arts and crafts, and in all the forms of culture, and so naturally to make sure that men and women have a breadth of view and width of life to match the possibilities that the welfare state should and will offer. Surely this is of overwhelming importance and should call for the fullest enterprise by every thinking citizen. So many people ask what can they do to further the growth of human ideals. Everyone has some quality, some right, some interest which he or she can develop, and in developing it can teach the meaning of it to others. That way lies a true development of human life in society and the assurance of proper wealth of leisure which should now be forthcoming as the planning of our economic existence produces its results.

But if we call for such development of adult education, surely it should include religious education in all its forms? I have often been told that adults will never respond to evening schools in this field : from personal experience in running adult classes in religious philosophy, I aver this opinion to be quite unfounded. There

is a genuine desire for religious education for the adult, provided it is not dogmatic or obscurantist.

III. Human Relations in Industry

There are one or two aspects of human relations in industry which seem to require a wider application of Christian principles. For example, we all recognize the fact of trade unionism as good, that it is an essential part of industry and that the relations between the employers and the workers depend upon the working of the unions. But is it sufficiently appreciated that Christian members of trade unions have a responsibility to their unions, not merely to conform with the trade union decisions, but, even more, to function properly as members, to ensure that the policy of the union is developed so as to incorporate the true views of its members and their rightful interests? Is it not correct to say that much of the misunderstanding of the present decades is due to the extent to which the majority of trade union members leave the running of the unions and the attendance of meetings, etc., to the interested few? If trade unionism is to play its full part, as it should, in the future of the country, it must be by the recognition on the part of every trade union member that he has a duty as such to play his full share in the working life of that union.

On the other hand, have we recognized the Christian responsibilities of management sufficiently? We all know how much we expect management to become expert in the technology of their subject, and also to spend much of their leisure time in active interest in the social activities of their staffs. Yet, the main need to-day is for management at all levels to have special training in human relations within industry, for example in the ways and means of preserving personality within a large organization. Managers require to be trained not only in the science of their job but also in the full field of human relations within industry. That is being increasingly recognized and will promote the utmost good, especially as we older Edwardians disappear from the scene with our outmoded prejudices. But the further fact has to be driven home that it is the Christian responsibility of management at all levels to show, by precept and practice, how it is the duty of the individual, and particularly of an individual who seeks to control others, to make his life as wide as he possibly can. He must come to realize that all aspects of culture should be absorbed as far as he is able and that the field of religious interests and values should be cultivated by him, if he is to be 'whole'. This I would particularly stress. Without width of outlook and breadth of life no man is

capable of realizing his own possibilities, still less of controlling others.

This seems strange pleading when so much emphasis is placed on the need for furtherance of technical education so that people may be more competent in their jobs. That is a wonderful thing, but I say it will defeat itself unless it is matched by full-scale developments for extending cultural education and even instruction in the basic principles of religious philosophy; so that the higher a man advances, the wider his outlook will be and the more he sees of the ideals of life which he is seeking to devolop in his own organization.

I can perhaps illustrate this by referring to the William Temple College at Rugby, which is actively going ahead with work in this field. I quote from the Prospectus :

> 'The purpose of the College is to provide a place in which men and women may study the Christian faith in relation to contemporary society. To this end it arranges courses and conferences of various kinds and length for those who desire, either as individuals or as members of an organized group, thus to consider some subject, or some aspect of their life and work. It hopes particularly to meet the needs of those who bear, or who are preparing to bear, responsibility in industry, commerce, education, the professions, public administration, the social services and the Christian Church. It intends to include in these courses some members from oversea. It encourages all members of a course to enter into an integrated series of studies related to their individual abilities and needs . . . The college aims in this way to promote the integration of contemporary society in the light of the Christian faith by sending back into everyday life and work members of courses and conferences who have thus studied in a community in which all give and receive knowledge and ideas from one another.'

But this is, of course, a special case of a national college symbolizing a great name which stands for the widest possible ideals in industry and at the same time offering a central staff college for the nation to think out its critical problems in the humanization of industry within the ideal life of a Christian society. There are others of a parallel nature going forward which call for great commendation, for example, the Y.M.C.A. organization has residential colleges for workers of all levels to have cultural training which will supplement technical efficiency. There are also a number of individual colleges throughout the country seeking to do the same thing. This sort of enterprise is needed on the widest possible scale to match the practice now prevailing throughout the organized industries of having residential colleges for all grades of their staffs. What is needed is that these residential courses should be supplemented by others to cover these wider problems of cultural

development and the ideals of life as revealed in art, science, religion and philosophy.

Finally, I would plead for the virtues of wider interests, particularly for those on routine work. Let us think of the picture of the lady in her drawing room and her technique for relieving the boredom of tea-table chatter by assiduously applying herself to knit — or have I got it the wrong way round? Is the tea-table chatter the relief from the boredom of knitting? The fact remains that workers engaged on routine mass production cannot have happy lives unless they are organized in groups of individuals who experience some wider group interest which is kept as a current theme of conversation and social activity; or, again, by the organization of music while you work or other inducements aimed at giving life a wider setting, whilst at the same time the routine job is being carried forward by acquired habit. In other words, the psychological aspect of the routine work is greatly helped if the breadth of interest in life is widened, even though the body has to be drilled into purely repetitive routines of operation.

IV. Current Sociological Developments

I have already referred to the need for adult education. This is emphasized by the rapid introduction of radio and television which are so popular that they threaten to reduce human beings to the category of 'watchers'. We have got accustomed to the problem of watchers of sport on a large scale, but if this development of watching television should develop as it threatens, we may well find that which should be an amenity to life and education, leading rather to the loss of that individual initiative which is so essential for cultural growth.

This is also unfortunately matched by the drift away from the churches, and we are experiencing the problem of maintaining the churches in proper working conditions not only from the point of view of keeping the nation spiritually alive, but also from the more sordid aspect of financially paying its way. More and more the churches tend to be looked to by the masses as the tribal centres where the larger mysteries of life such as birth, marriage and death may be suitably recognized; but apart from that, people seem to be uninterested, and it is idle to talk about a spiritual revival unless there is some enduring core for religious enthusiasm in life.

Yet, it may well be argued that the recent revival under Dr. Billy Graham in England and the public rallies at the Church Congress in Chicago have proved the religious instinct to be very much alive. That proof is greatly to be welcomed and it behoves the churches fully to take hold of it. But the very movement led

by Billy Graham illustrates the difficulty in mind. Having talked to people who attended his services, I was struck by the fact that none of them had any reaction other than to the emotional appeal of person to person: there had been no background of doctrine. It is all to the good that such a revival should re-awaken the population periodically and should be recognized and supported at the highest levels, but such movements can, in the end, do harm if they are not associated with a real development of religion, in substance and depth providing a permanent spiritual core to society. The churches must re-find themselves as the regular forum for local life, not only from the religious standpoint, but also from the cultural.

This is one further point that I would seek to make under this particular heading. We are passing through a phase of alleged indifference to organized religions, yet the sparks lit by Billy Graham prove that the religious instinct is fully alive and that humanity hungers, albeit subconsciously, for it knows not what. It is for the Church to recognize these symptoms and supply the need. That will not be done by merely preaching ethics. Billy Graham has demonstrated that religion must be an appeal of person to person. This is an opportunity for Christianity to show itself as fully meeting that stipulation with its emphasis on the centrality of Christ as living Person.

V. Twentieth-Century Thought

A few pointers under this heading seem to be called for in view of the seeming inability of the churches to cater for the rising generations. This is a bald statement of fact, but I doubt if anybody would seriously challenge it. Anyone who has had much discussion with serious groups of the younger generation must have been struck by their intense attraction towards the scientific spirit, with its determination to pursue truth at all costs and jettison anything which may savour of subjective pleading. That in itself is the basic problem for the religious leaders to-day. Their work will fail unless they can capture the rising generation, and particularly those members of it who are thinking. Much thought is going on with the younger members of society. As I say, it is mainly scientific in character and coloured by the strong tendencies of to-day towards technical education and the need to become specialized to attain the means of livelihood. Yet underlying all this it is very easy to detect the same clear unrest that Billy Graham has revealed to be behind the apparent apathy of the masses. Again and again serious students will flash out challenges related to their ethical dilemmas which reveal that though they have sought the scientific

deity, and for all their protestations to the contrary, they are spiritually unsatisfied.

We are passing through an age which accentuates its spiritual difficulties because of the pressures exerted by industry for technological advance, with the high degree of specialization which that entails. Culture is losing the struggle with technology in the Universities and the specialist vogue is killing the sense of responsibility for attempting a synthesis over wider ranges. The outcome of all this must be narrowness of outlook and constriction of living interests, as opposed to the width of view and breadth of life so essential for the ' whole ' man.

Coupled with this we have the problem that modern thinking seeks to focus life in terms of experience ' here and now '. The logical positivist is not out of touch with the times; rather he is the source of the current outlook which adopts his dictum that nothing has any meaning unless it can be observed and tested by means of sense experience. By this test, religion and metaphysics must be ruled out as being meaningless. This background must aggravate the turning away from religious matters. With all this, there is not only the danger of disinterest in religion as such, but even of losing that residual belief of what is always called the ' eternal verities ', which are frowned upon by the logical positivist as meaningless. This must weigh seriously against the chance of recalling humanity to a sense of destiny and purpose in life as against the pursuit of a material paradise here on earth, for coming generations who will have done nothing to deserve such enjoyment. The scientist is, nevertheless, seriously perturbed when he applies his technology to what he paradoxically regards as the detriment of the human race. For example, when hydrogen bombs are in question, he rightly raises the question of moral responsibility in the matter. But how can he argue such moral responsibility if he believes the ' eternal verities ' to be exorcized together with the possibility of any spiritual source from which they might have derived?

All this stresses the serious problem that awaits the individual member of society to-day without any adequate background of group guidance such as the churches have hitherto provided. It is not that life has become less intense and therefore that advice is not necessary; rather the stresses and strains of modern existence are seriously aggravated. The speeds of communication and the so-called facilities of modern life have not eased the stress, they have intensified it. This must mean an increasing measure of pathological symptoms throughout the working population. Such

symptoms would be relieved if group life focused on the churches would re-find itself.

VI. The Problem of the Churches

This brings us to the need to face the problem of the churches and to get the status of the parish re-defined within the setting of national and local life. Experiments are going on with specialized treatment of industry and its problems, e.g. of religious chaplains working in the industries, but it is doubtful if such a movement is likely to be successful except in favourable districts, like Sheffield. The possibilities of this movement seem to be somewhat dimmed by the recent unhappy experience of the movement for priests to work in industry in France. Rather the parish must be looked to increasingly as the developed focus for the lives of the working people outside their working hours. Human relations are all for the good within industry, but they must be matched by human relations in the parish if there is to be a balanced whole. For this, the parish should, I submit, be so established as the working unit that it will be possible for the incumbent to function in full association with (*a*) his colleagues of the other denominations; and (*b*) the local industry organizations which are catering for the people during their working time. This will mean some special organization by the churches in general and the Church of England in particular so that they may fulfil their responsibilities, both central and local. It will be particularly necessary for the Church of Engand to develop some form of central brain for industrial problems on the one hand, and possibly a similar central brain for the development of working progress within the parishes as a suitable counterpart. This will need to be supplemented by special training courses not only for newly-recruited clergy, but also for existing incumbents of parishes. Surely it is most desirable that men in such appointments should have periodical refreshers in the new interests which they are required to develop in their districts? I would plead for recognition of the full-scale need for organizational thought and development in this sphere.

VII. The 'Eternal Verities'

I have already suggested that the 'eternal verities' will only survive if coupled with the living witness of the churches and their members. This means a re-presentation of Christianity in thought and practice as the belief in God, and the parallel belief in the spiritual world, focused on the eternal Christ as living 'Person' responding to each and every individual. This seems to me to be the core of a religious revival which can be reinforced both by

membership of the Church as a living society and training of the inner spiritual life. Then it may be possible to bring home to humanity that the five senses of the physical life are matched by five imperatives of the spiritual life. The five imperatives of conscience are those which call man :

(i) to pursue truth for truth's sake. It is his duty to develop the highest qualities that are in him by educational endeavour throughout his life as a matter of duty to himself and to his Creator;

(ii) to appreciate beauty as a basic element of the scheme of things with the parallel complement not merely to appreciate it but to seek to manifest it in every, and in even the smallest walks of life;

(iii) to glimpse moral goodness inherent in all and give everyone the fullest opportunity for developing their characters in the sight of God and man;

(iv) to observe the duty of reverencing life as the supreme mystery which must be served with humility and yet with resolution as that which is so worthwhile that it is ' sinning against the Light ' not to strive to do our utmost to make it what it should be;

(v) to obey the over-riding call to the individual to become himself. That is, so to integrate himself that he becomes a living, self-conscious and effective personality. This is the highest call of conscience, but one that is not recognized to the extent that it should be. How otherwise could all our mental hospitals be filled to capacity with so-called split personalities? It is man's supreme duty to become a living person, and the only way to become an integrated living person is to live in relationship with one's fellows. The working group is the one means of enabling individuals to be shaped by the interplay between the members of the group. Here is an essential complementary process to the inner life of the individual. It is for this reason that the group relationships within industry are so important and correspondingly why the parish life must itself be organized and integrated to facilitate the integration of its individual members into spiritual persons.

It is obvious that it is impossible for me to deal now with the more controversial issues of sociological problems such as divorce, birth control, eugenics, euthanasia and such allied problems. These are all critical issues which should be explored and treated by the churches. They cannot be ignored without loss of standing in the face of society, who find these problems really acute.

WORK, LEISURE AND RELIGION

By John Marsh, Esq., Director of the Industrial Welfare Society

I MUST make it clear at once that in setting out some thoughts on this wide subject I am speaking as an individual layman of the Church of England. I propose to comment on some of the trends at work and in leisure and the application of religious principles, and at the end I will endeavour to give a pointer to at least one hopeful trend for the future, which needs further study.

Of the twenty-three million people gainfully employed in Britain, just over seven million are known as the 'Industrial Population'. About forty per cent. of these seven million work in very small factories employing less than 250 people. There are indeed large establishments employing huge numbers of workers of many categories, and we tend to hear most often of their difficulties and their industrial and social achievements. As the country with the longest experience of industrialization, we should know more of the answers to the problems of modern industrial society than we do. In point of fact, I doubt very much whether we are an industrial society. In the last twenty years or so it has become much more respectable socially to work in industry, but even now I imagine that a great number of parents have misgivings, which they find difficulty in expressing, when it comes to recommending their children to take up a career of industry. A job in government or local government service, the professions, or what are sometimes the more lucrative and exciting realms of commerce, is often sought for the bright young man rather than in the production of goods and services which we call industry. A determined effort has been made since the war to attract school leavers and university graduates to industry, with encouraging results. The fact is, of course, that life for the great majority of the working population of this country is a humdrum affair. Work is what you have to do to exist, and I suppose, on the other hand, leisure is the time you have to do what you want to do, which is presumably to try to live in a purposeful way.

The increasing use of mass production and the present emphasis of 'change' in ways of doing things is having a profound effect on the happiness and 'self-respect' of millions of our fellow-men. Human effort is being replaced by new machines and gadgets, and where this is not possible, methods of using human skill are being simplified by the techniques of work, study and a refinement of it called 'ergonomics'. The introduction of new synthetic materials, the tremendous potential of applying electronics in developing new machines are to have a revolutionary

effect on the lives of men and women doing new jobs which are perhaps humdrum, but in which at present they still use skill and experience of a kind which gives at least minor satisfactions of achievement.

It is said that we need more and more technologists and technicians to manufacture these materials and machines, and so we do. There is a great and exciting scope for the really intelligent and highly educated section of the population.

But what of the rest? To sell the need for using these new devices requires sociological skill of an order we at present know little about. In fact our scientific and engineering advance far outstrips our knowledge of human behaviour in to-day's gregarious and uneasy society. Before we can achieve these scientific and engineering advances, we must anticipate and plan for the crucial political and social problems which they in turn create. Research into the human problems caused by industrialization is extremely limited — and Dr. E. D. Adrian's presidential address at this year's British Association contained a bold and timely challenge which must be heeded. I quote only a few lines from a *Times* report:

> 'By the control achieved over the forces of nature which was now so complete, we might soon become able to destroy two-thirds of the world by pressing a button. We may perhaps improve ourselves more rapidly if we can gain more insight into human behaviour.
>
> 'At present there were many kinds of investigation grouped under the umbrella of social science: the groups, the President said, seemed to have little in common and few of them could put their results into figures. But he thought that scientists and laymen alike were becoming more aware of the value of social investigation and of the degree of certainty it could bring. There were facts to be found out about our usefulness in society, about our relations to one another, and about the risks we take. The search for these facts could be conducted on reasonably scientific lines. It was too early to be cautious in spending money on large-scale investigations; they were bound to be costly, and those of the social scientist deserved not only the support of national and international funds. There is a kind of support for the subject already, but it is too important a plant to be left in the hothouse atmosphere of research institutes and Unesco teams. It deserves to be in full contact with all the conservative and academic people in Universities, the lawyers and historians as well as the economists, biologists, and statisticians. There must be more social scientists in our Universities so that the rising generation can see what they are like. The stage seemed to be set for the new development, and it might well be the most important scientific development of this century.'

Human Relations at Work

Industry has for a long time been welfare-minded. The provision for good physical amenities or sports and social activities

outside working hours has received a great deal of attention, especially in the last thirty years. Sport and social activities took the form of paternalistic benevolence in between the wars, but I think it would be true to say that many of the outside work activities provided by companies are to-day not really wanted by the majority of employees. It is difficult to generalize on this subject, but there is a significant change taking place now. There is no doubt that the justification for welfare schemes, whether assisted by the State or a firm or a jointly-run benevolent fund, is quite clear in the case of the old, disabled or those who are ill. In the case of fit people, including juveniles, the conviction is growing that welfare should be defined as 'helping people to stand on their own feet'. We all know that the successful sports or social activity is that which requires considerable spare time keenness and work by enthusiasts and devotees. If people have to roll the pitch themselves, or their wives prepare for the children's party in a hundred kitchens, the event is more deeply satisfying than if the rolling was done by full-time officials and professional caterers provided the feast at so much per head. All of us like to give something as long as the decision to give is ours. Similarly I believe that the trend to appoint full-time government officials to do welfare work which previously depended on voluntary efforts has long-term disadvantages; if we are hastening on an age of more leisure, then let's leave room for leisure to be purposeful. The big difficulty of our time seems to be that as much as possible should be done to provide for the security for a man and his family without removing the element of 'challenge'. In a word, the Christian call to 'Love one's neighbour' does not mean 'carry one's neighbour'.

A vital question in this age of mass movements and big enterprises is that of the individual's relationship with his group. More and more we have to do things which we conscientiously believe to be unwise or even wrong. How far is it possible to be intellectually honest in much that we do to-day, as workers and citizens? Powerful forces are at work everywhere which make many men say, 'What's the use of resisting them or trying to influence them — events are too big for us'. I fear we are losing much of the pioneering spirit in our political and social life because of this, and yet so much of our progress depends on the man who is 'inspired' to take a chance, who has faith to see an idea through — with all the suffering that such a responsibility entails. Our loyalties tend to be superficial, class and other prejudices inhibit a true development of society, and many a man, whether executive or workman, becomes frustrated, bitter and finally apathetic

because he is not allowed by the 'law of the situation' to serve his own conscience.

Then we have the influence of specialization. The specialists are among us with a vengeance. We have them in the Church, in science, industry and in the professions, in youth work and particularly in medicine. Industry creates new specialists every year. On the personnel or human relations side of industry we have the recruitment officer, the education officer, the training officer, the joint consultation organizer, the wages bargaining expert, the safety officer, the apprentice supervisor, the communications expert, the establishment officer, the welfare officer and the sick visitor, to name some of them. They all tend to look at man in segments, from a safety point of view or that of earning potential or training. What we need surely in all walks of life are people who can look at total man. To begin the process, let us have a look at jargon. Man isn't a 'physico-psycho entity in a space-time continuum' nor is he a 'work unit'. Whether he's a skilled man or not, he is also a religious man, a family man, a gardener, a left or right winger, a football fan and a mixture of fears and hopes of many things. One of the oldest specialists, surely, is the priest. He is the expert on Faith, the authority on doctrine. If he has not the key to this world, he may at least unlock the door to the next. The layman, I admit, has failed to think out his responsibility in the Church, has put the priest in this difficult position. But apart from this, is the priest truly prepared for his tasks in this industrial age — what is his pastoral role to-day?

In industry a new religion of 'human relations' has arrived. Its 'priests' are the welfare and personnel officers (of whom I am one). The personnel or welfare officers and the priest have much in common:

They are interested in influencing people.
They need a sense of vocation and training to deal with people.
Neither can produce final answers to human problems.
Both complain of having lonely jobs — of doing pioneering work in their respective parishes.
Both have doctrinal differences with their colleagues — both can be heretical.
Both use jargon which confounds the laity.

And so one could go in with the comparison, but in the final analysis there is a great philosophical difference between them. Put simply, the priest says, 'I love my neighbour, but I love God first'; the personnel and welfare officer says, 'I love my neighbour'

— but which God comes first? Is it the profitability of industry, efficiency, productivity, humanitarianism or what?

May I suggest that the humanitarian movement in industry is no accident: the early trade unionists, the enlightened employers of generations ago who started this between them were, as we know, largely prompted by their Christian beliefs. With the growth of humanization in industry there has been a marked decline in the support of organized religion; can it be that God has found a way for part of His work to be done more effectively in industry — in spite of the Churches?

If, as one must admit, much of this human relations work in industry is done without acknowledging Christianity as its inspiration, surely here is an opportunity for understanding and reconciliation between industry and the Churches. I believe that many in industry are anxious to examine this just now.

Leisure

Leisure is the time you have to do what you wish to do. R. H. Tawney said many years ago that man has such a hypochondriacal interest in *working* that he does not give himself time for *living*. In the nature of my job I associate mainly with professional people, many of whom have responsible jobs. We have not much time for different occupations in our leisure time. The reading and thinking we do at home is mostly associated with work, as we are afraid of missing something worthwhile in the mass of printed matter which floods us to-day. The happiest, most balanced men I know are those who have an absorbing hobby — completely different from their normal work. Playing games, gardening, odd jobbing, caring for animals bring peace of mind and a fuller life to millions. Leisure is purposeful if it stops loneliness and brings happiness and perspective into our lives. The gardener finds a challenge in his seasonal chores, so does the amateur radio mechanic, bricklayer or artist. A promising development in industrial welfare schemes is the recent and rapid growth of hobbies clubs.

Perhaps the leisure we are most critical of is that which needs thrills to sustain it. A thrill is often thought to be a challenge. Watching football, the speedway, the cinema and sometimes television is not only an escape, but provides a chance of experiencing a thrill, the player sent off for fouling, the motor-cycle accident that fractured the rider's ribs, the girl who in two hours at the films became 'that kind of woman' or perhaps Lady Barnett dropped an ear-ring during 'What's my line'.

Television, which I enjoy at times, seems to have possibilities for helping us all to lead a life of greater understanding and happiness, which far outweigh the sinister cultural influence which some Jeremiahs ascribe to it. As a medium it is in its infancy, its social and cultural uses are only beginning to be apparent. In these early days it is not surprising that Gilbert Harding's utterances of common-sense or nonsense have more influence as talking points for millions than anything the Archbishop of Canterbury says at Minneapolis or Evanston. As a means of communication, the Church needs to embrace television, and adapt its message to modern needs, in modern terms.

Voluntary activities in leisure time need new thinking too. Our youth clubs need imagination and bold experiments, and the element of Commando challenge in their activities. Those movements which flourish are those which make their adherents say, 'here is something I can do for others besides myself', not 'here is something which is done for me'.

The value of group discussions in the pattern of social behaviour must not be under-estimated. Too often the literary society, the youth club, has a talk of forty-five minutes, followed by a few embarrassed questions to help the proceedings to a spluttering end. Group activities of this kind (at work, in leisure hours and in the churches too) are essentially participatory. People want to say their pieces, they want to think aloud, if only given the right climate to do so. This age is full of big and vital issues which men intuitively feel they must discuss, and surely discussion is the basis of our democratic way of life.

The training of leaders, in industry, voluntary activities and in the Church, must in future include a sound knowledge of these social skills.

The provision of opportunities for discussion is one of the finest ways of opening men's minds and keeping them open. The chairman's monologue, the lecturer's hour-long dissertation, the priest's jargon-ridden sermon on eternal truths must be sparingly used in an age when exhortation from without has failed. I believe that man is very ready to listen to the divine promptings from within himself.

Religion

I believe that the Christian religion provides the only real answer to the contemporary problems of man. I further believe that the Churches have failed to come to grips with modern society and that they try to talk to an essentially modern man in language which belongs to earlier centuries. I must confess that doctrinal

differences leave me cold, the finer points of liturgy have little meaning, and many of the worthy men of the priesthood to-day seem to be victims of ecclesiastical circumstances which they are apparently powerless to alter. Is it any wonder that the average man in Britain, who is basically religious, resists organized religion even more than he resists the organization of work, which at least can include him in its results? I am not going to criticize the priesthood any further. I know that my fellow-laymen of the Church of England have a grave responsibility for things as they are. I shall, therefore, deal with what a layman feels about these things and leave it for your charitable consideration.

The social sciences of psychology, psychiatry, sociology and anthropology have emerged in this century. They have had cycles of quickening interest, followed by others of indifference. If Professor Adrian has his way, we are in for decades of further research and experiment. These manifestations of social science and the humanitarian movement in industry are linked, but it is not a happy or convincing partnership so far. It could be, if these trends and developments could be brought into a Christian perspective. The sociologists and their other colleagues have a realistic and timely contribution to make, but they have already convinced many of us (and I believe some of their own number too) that man's answers to man's problems are inadequate and often false.

Perhaps you will agree that God has been working through these new fields of knowledge; it is time surely for the Christian Church to wake up and study what has been going on, examine it, discuss it, reject what is unsound and embrace what is good for the hastening of God's kingdom.

There are stirrings amongst the laity. I don't mean the devoted few who have faithfully constituted the small congregations. I refer to the laity who are not communicants or church-goers. Since 1947, or thereabouts, many of my friends and I have been aware of what may be a new begininng for our generation.

I believe that thousands of thinking men and women in Britain are profoundly disturbed with the great moral and material issues of our time. The advancement of science and engineering, the political and social revolutions which are going on nationally and internationally, and the urgency of the spiritual void in which we have found ourselves have caused it.

What form does this awakening take?

First, there is the *stage of awareness*; we are aware that man cannot solve his own problems, and we are feeling out for the Christian answer.

Secondly, following awareness, there is a *need for fellowship* amongst men and women of like mind. That is why in industry to-day there is a growing movement amongst responsible people to get together and discuss their difficulties in the spirit of Christianity.

Thirdly, awareness and fellowship are not enough. Before real action can be achieved there is a *need for guidance*. We must turn to the sources of Christian knowledge — the priests and the Churches. The crucial question is, can they, if they know some of the answers, talk in language which we understand with a consistency which we can accept and practice? How many religious books, newspapers and periodicals can strip themselves of technical terms, cliches and outmoded verbiage so that they can reach the average man?

The fourth stage is action. A branch of the tree of life cannot live unless it bears fruit, and although many a workman, manager or technician in industry is probably doing his best, how much better could he do if he felt and knew that the Spirit was working *through* him.

Those of us who are in these stages of experience to-day want to be positive.

Before summing up, let me be fair and say that there is already a very hopeful response from sections of the Church. In many dioceses a new understanding is coming about. Small groups of priests and laymen (including many who are not identified with the Churches) are getting together. In Leicester, Bristol, Southwark, Sheffield, Manchester and Birmingham, and other areas too, regular and earnest discussions are taking place, and those participating come from all sides of industry. Here is great hope for those of us who see the need, and are willing to help. One hopes that the Church authorities are aware of these significant developments, and will lend support to them. Much seems to depend on local initiative, which is of course only right, but there are great differences in approach which confuse and dismay the laymen. What, for example, is the part of the industrial chaplain? Are canteen services really effective, and what should be the formula which gives a priest entry to the place of work?

Apart from these movements in the Church of England, other denominations and specialist Christian organizations are also playing their part. The Church of Scotland, the Methodists and the Congregationalists are in some ways quicker to recognize the problems of an industrialized society.

I believe that the reconstructed William Temple College will become a powerful influence, as well as a much needed clearing

house in hastening on this work. Its interdenominational basis is a very helpful augury for the future. The Church, the priests and ourselves must not fail this time. What we seek is not a casual membership; not a pietistic transformation in ourselves. We seek a chance to be dedicated in our work, in our leisure and, above all, in our service to God. What is a dedicated layman? I hope I have given an indication of *why* he wants to be dedicated. *How* does he become one, *what* does he do, *where* does he go?

I believe a dedicated person must know by spiritual experience that the Spirit of God can work through him. Very often, of course, he will not be fitted for this service. Dedication means rededication again and again in an effort to overcome the frailties of man. It means that he commits his daily work, his leisure and his family responsibilities to God. There are, in these days of monolithic organization, great events and terrifying issues, affecting the fate of man, many opportunities for the dedicated layman to develop his pastoral concern. He may be in a position to initiate action, write the right letter, say the right word to someone else who is in need of direction and purpose. He can, as a catalyst in discussion, be of help in a robust way, he need not be 'pi', his capacity to influence others will be transparent on occasions — totally lacking at other times. The more he loves and aids his neighbour to aid himself, the more he'll forget his own problems. Is it as plain as that?

One proviso I must mention. I do not suggest that a man should believe in 'intuitive guidance'. He needs fellowship and worship and Bible Study with those of like mind; and of course the way of fellowship is not an easy one. If man wants a true challenge in his life, Christianity provides it. The Church of God is in being when *two or three* are gathered together, and the real tragedy of our time is that we fail to grasp this simple truth.

THE HUMAN FACTOR IN BUSINESS

By Gerald Steel, Managing Director of the United Steel Companies

AS my own experience of business is confined to manufacturing industry, namely, the iron and steel industry, perhaps I should begin by giving very briefly some idea of the undertaking by which I am employed.

It is a company which provides employment for about 35,000 persons in all at seven major operating works, plants, mines and quarries in Cumberland, Lincolnshire, South Yorkshire and Rutland, with administrative headquarters in Sheffield. It is a large concern, as iron and steel companies go, and its range of products is more varied than most, ranging from such things as buildings; locomotives and other heavy products for railways; ship plates and mining machinery; down to such small articles as, for example, umbrella frames and watch springs. It thus employs many and varied kinds of men and women, trades and skills.

The methods by which this rather complex undertaking is organized and controlled are interesting, I think, but irrelevant to the present subject. There is, however, one feature that it will be as well to mention here because I shall refer to it later. We have Works Councils at each operating unit, as is the practice of most companies nowadays, and once each year we hold a week-end Conference of Works Councils, usually at some place like Harrogate, that is to say, in pleasant surroundings and a long way from the bustle and noise in which we spend our working lives. The Conference is attended by six or seven workmen from each operating unit, together with their General and Works Managers, Labour, Welfare and Education Officers and the like, and also by all the senior officials at the Head Office, including the executive directors of the company. A number of business sessions are held (one of the workmen always being in the chair) and the opportunity is taken, first for us to talk to them about such things as the progress of the company, including a full explanation of the preceding year's profit and loss account and balance sheet: trade prospects — which means the prospect of continuing full employment or the reverse — in the near and distant future, and the company's plans for development and expansion.

One whole session or, if necessary, two sessions are devoted to the cross-examination of the management by the workmen's representatives. No holds are barred: they may ask any questions

they like except about wage arrangements, which are unanimously agreed to be the prerogative of the Trade Unions, and we do our best to give them full and straightforward answers. For that matter we have to do so, because they are not at all inclined to be put off with generalities or evasions!

After these few words by way of introduction, I return to the beginning, that is to say, to the title of this talk, one good feature of which is that it is so ambiguous, or rather that its scope is so wide, that it allows one to deal with almost any subject. My difficulty has been, not to search for something to say, but to decide which of the many aspects of the subject I should try to deal with in the relatively short time that is available. In the end it seemed to me that the best plan might be to discuss a few aspects of what are commonly called employer-employee relations: to define their objective: to point out some of the difficulties in the way of attaining that objective: and to suggest remedies, where I can.

In this context, what is the meaning and significance of the phrase 'employer-employee relations'? The tools used in this connection are well known, and include such things as incentive schemes; pensions; works councils; joint consultation; medical services; accident prevention; suggestion schemes; education; training; promotion policy; introductory courses; wages policy; the provision of canteens, baths and other so-called amenities within the works; and of playing fields and other opportunities for social activity outside them; paid holidays; housing; communications; and so on.

Those are some of the tools: to what end are they intended to be used? I think there are two answers to that question, the one material and the other humanitarian — namely, in order on the one hand that productivity may be increased, and on the other that universal interest and contentment may be restored to work. Or, those answers may be brought together so as to produce the following definition:

> In order that the division of interest which at present characterizes our national effort may be turned into unity, for the benefit of all and the exploitation of none.

That is the goal.

And now, before proceeding to examine some of the factors which make that goal difficult to achieve, it will be convenient to refer here to certain commonly accepted labels that it will be necessary to use, for instance, 'both sides of industry'; 'the employers' and 'the workers'. To my mind, all three of these labels are inapposite and provocative, and a good deal of progress would have been made if all those engaged in industry could be persuaded to

that view. There is only one side to industry, not two, for those who manage large-scale industrial undertakings are, in the vast majority of cases to-day, not employers but employees (as I shall show later). And those who spend most of their lives at office desks are as much 'workers' as are those who wheel barrows, stoke furnaces or operate controls. Nevertheless, these labels are the current jargon, and they must be used if circumlocution is to be avoided.

Returning now to my theme, it seems to me that a large part of the problem is one of attitudes. It is changes of attitude, and of heart, on the part of workers and employers, that are necessary if the goal is to be reached. These attitudes are changing, but not nearly fast enough: what is standing in the way? Past history, social and industrial, is one factor: another is the fact that many of the grievances and much of the distrust arise from ingrained beliefs which are no longer valid: then there is the difficulty of communication between employer and employee, and there is also the cynicism and lack of a guiding purpose in life which have resulted from, among other causes, two world wars in a generation.

It is unnecessary to deal at any length with the point about past history. It so happens that I have lately been reading Mrs. Woodham Smith's book, *The Reason Why*, and although her description of the way in which it was possible for man to treat man in this country of ours, so relatively short a time ago, contained nothing of which one has not previously known, it somehow brought home to me, as no social history had done before, the legacy which has been handed down to us. It is not surprising that such a record of inhumanity lingers in the memory of the descendants of those English soldiers, tenants and labourers whose lot is described in the first part of the book, any more than it is altogether surprising that there still remain some Irish men and women who have no great love for the English.

Among the ingrained beliefs to which I referred as being no longer valid are those which may be described as the Evil of the Profit Motive and the Greed of the Masters (or, as they seem to be popularly known in our industry, the 'Steel Barons', although, as a matter of fact, I don't think there is a single peer connected with management in the heavy steel industry to-day). So much that is false and dangerous has been and still is being said and written about these two subjects that the workmen can hardly be blamed if he firmly believes that profit is an evil thing and that his so-called employers have no object in life beyond making fortunes for themselves.

Nor can the Trade Unions be blamed, because these accusa-

tions were doubtless true enough in many instances in the past and also because the Unions, having had so much to contend with in their early days that they were forced to use any and every weapon that came to their hands, are finding it difficult to drop those weapons. Now that so many of those at the head of the Trade Unions have become statesmen and national leaders they would like to drop them — and most of them have done so — because it is difficult to persuade men to work harder and to produce more and still more for the salvation of the country, and at the same time to continue to preach the doctrine that the sole result of increased productivity is to put more and more cash into the pockets of the masters.

As I have said, neither the workers nor the Trade Unions are to be blamed for this state of affairs, but the same cannot be said for those who deliberately encourage and incite class warfare. The doctrine that they preach has a profound effect on many of the workers, and quite naturally so because, one of the outstanding traits of the British working man being his loyalty to his own people, he feels that his allegiance must be to those who profess to uphold the rights of 'the downtrodden worker'. There is nothing that the industrialist can do to combat this evil.

In any case, what are the facts?

It seems to me that one of the most significant changes that has taken place in industry in the last few decades has been that of ownership. It is not so very long, in the scheme of things, since the vast majority of industrial undertakings were owned lock, stock and barrel by a few individuals—very often by a family—and managed by them. Every additional penny that these proprietor-managers could screw out of the consuming public found its way into their own pockets and, conversely, every advance in wages that the workpeople could secure by negotiations or withholding their labour came out of the pocket of the proprietor-managers, as did the cost of any measures designed to improve working conditions. Human nature being what it was (and still is) it is not altogether surprising that the proprietors of industrial undertakings, with many honourable exceptions, had little thought for the interest of the consumer and the strongest possible disinclination to increase wages or improve the conditions under which their 'hands' laboured, however impossible it may have been to exist on the wage that was paid and however intolerable the working conditions. Moreover, since the social conscience of the country had not been awakened or, at any rate, had no means of making itself heard, the attitude and behaviour of the proprietor-managers was not generally regarded as being unreasonable or

blameworthy. It was regarded as natural and inevitable and it had the sanction of custom.

If I have laboured these elementary facts it is because I want to underline the change that has taken place since those days. On the one hand, the invention of mass production methods has so increased the minimum economic size of industrial units and their cost that few, if any, individuals or families remain who could find the capital required to establish them and, on the other hand, the last few decades of high income tax, surtax and, above all, death duties have finally squeezed out the descendants of the old proprietor class. As a result, the vast majority of industrial undertakings to-day belong either to large numbers of individuals known as shareholders—and in most cases to holders of small blocks of shares — or to the State, and the so-called Masters are salaried employees with, more often than not, a negligible shareholding or none at all.

If what has been said so far be accepted it follows, I submit, that there is nothing evil in the profit motive, indeed the attainment of a large surplus must be, should be, and is the objective of every manufacturing enterprise, whether it belongs to the shareholding public or to the State. Not, however, in order to line the pockets of the managers or those of the shareholders—who get little enough in all conscience—but for these reasons: in order to be able to maintain their works and plants in first-rate condition and in line with, if not ahead of, the best modern practice; in order that they may continue to produce not only the goods required by consumers at home at the price they can afford to pay but also the foreign currency the country needs so sorely; and, hence, in order to safeguard continuing employment and a decent standard of living for their employees and their dependents.

And so the comparatively new class of person, the employee-manager, with little or no direct financial share in the profit made by his employers the shareholders, has no urge whatever either to make the consumer pay more than is right and reasonable, or to attempt to enforce an inequitable wage structure or bad working conditions upon the company's workmen-employees. He is, on the contrary, as conscious of his duty to provide for the comfort and general well-being of the whole of the Company's employees as he is of his duty to safeguard the proprietors' interest, whether the proprietor be a large number of individuals in conditions known as Private Enterprise or the State, under what is called nationalisation.

I have now attempted to show that the transformation of industrial undertakings from small to very large units has resulted, no

doubt quite fortuitously, in a change in the pattern of ownership, in the virtual elimination of the 'Master' class and, hence, of the urge—and, for that matter, the ability—to 'get rich quick' at the expense of those who produce and consume. That is all to the good, but what is not so good is the fact that in the majority of cases concerns have grown so vast that it is impossible for those who control them to have any kind of personal contact with more than a handful of the rest of the employees. This is the problem of 'communications'.

In my grandfather's time every man in the works was known personally to one or other of the partners, who were aware of their circumstances, joys and sorrows, and of such important things as the state of health of the missus and kids. In this way every employee knew from personal contact what was in the minds of the partners and the motives which actuated them: in cases where the partners had ideals the men were well aware of the fact and derived feelings of comfort, security and loyalty from it.

To-day, everything must be done by delegation, and it is well known that with the best will in the world a message starting at one end of a chain emerges at the other end in a distorted and garbled form. Moreover, the best will in the world does not always exist: it is too much to expect that modern ideas and ideals should be immediately acceptable to every one of the older departmental managers and foremen, who were brought up in very different times. Indeed, individual Works Councillors have said to me on many occasions, at the annual Conferences to which I have already referred, 'we believe what you and the Chairman tell us, but what you say, and what those down the line do, are very different things'.

These are problems: first how to ensure that the management's ideals are loyally accepted and acted upon by the rest of the staff, and secondly, how to ensure that the goodwill of the management becomes known—and believed in—throughout the organisation. For it is in these ways only that the legacy of suspicion and mistrust can be wiped out and a relationship of mutual trust and confidence established.

There is no short-cut to success in either case. Time and education seem to be the only solution to the first but there are one or two additional approaches to the second problem.

In our own company, for example, we make a practice of addressing the annual conference of Works Councils on such subjects as those I have been dealing with this morning, namely the falsity of the ideas that the Profit Motive is Evil and the Masters are Greedy. From what I have sensed and been told, both by

Works Councillors themselves and by those of the management who were present, I have no doubt at all that the workmen's representatives appreciated and believed what was said. But, unfortunately, we have this direct contact with not more than 40 or 50 each year, out of a total complement of over 30,000.

Verbatim reports of each annual conference are sent to every employee of the company and one may assume that some—but probably not many—of those who were not present will read them, but in any case it is one thing to listen to someone speaking with sincerity and conviction and quite another thing to read in cold blood what somebody said weeks or months ago—with his tongue in his cheek, for all one can tell. Again, those of the workmen's representatives who were really impressed will and do talk to their mates when they get back to the works about what they saw and heard and believed. But it is a painfully slow process and again there is probably no royal road to success.

Now with regard to the cynicism and lack of a guiding purpose in life which are generally prevalent to-day, I know of no remedy other than the work which is being carried out by the Church through the agency of such bodies as, for example, the Sheffield Industrial Mission. Until I discovered, at the last moment, that the subject of the Church in Industry is to be discussed to-morrow by someone far better qualified to do so than I am, I had intended to deal at length with the work of this devoted body, which is having so great an impact and inflence on the minds and attitudes of those engaged in our industry in the Sheffield area.

Under the circumstances I must confine myself to saying that we—and many other companies too—gladly throw our works open to the missioners, who talk to the men actually on the job and often between processes, in melting shops, mills, foundries, forges and machine shops. They become known in the departments and accepted by the working teams. They are able to organise meetings with the men, usually at 'snap' times and shift changes, which are extremely informal, humorous and yet serious, when all kinds of issues are dealt with. It is out of such shopfloor contacts that many projects develop and that from time to time men are stimulated themselves to become active leaders of the movement, who will organize meetings and bring their fellows to them and who will represent a point of view in the works, the office, the Works Council, the Branch Meeting and so on.

I am indebted to the Diocesan Missioner for the following description of their approach :

> The questions crying out for continuing creative thinking are legion in industry, and the most intractable are those concerned with the social,

personal and human factors. It is precisely such that the Christian faith is about. In a word, that is the basic justification for the Church's concern with industry.

It is important to reflect on some of those questions. There is the basic one — what has been the consequence of science and industry on modern life? They have made new possibilities for living. Are those possibilities for human beings realized in our works? How can we produce a sense of common purpose, interest and community in our works, or strengthen it? How can industrial relations be improved and men at all levels give of their best without reliance on 'whip', 'carrot' or paternalist 'soft soap'? What do justice; fair dealing; honesty; responsibility care for others, especially the weak — what do these demand of us in everyday industrial life? Are there structural changes required in industry? How can men be helped to have more status at work, pride in the job, satisfaction in working together? What is the very meaning and end of our life together in this world, in which work, industry, production and wages are such an important part? It is not possible to talk for long on these issues without raising what are in fact clear religious issues — what men believe to be right, what men believe to be basically true.

The very facing of such problems is the beginning of a contribution to their solution. To do so means a study of the facts, of other people's attitudes. It means having a conscience and an imagination about things in the works. It means taking action. There are, of course, no 'Christian solutions' as such. There always will be problems. But as industry and society evolve, good principles, Christian insights, moral sensitivity and hard work will all have their effect. The Industrial Mission, as the Church at her best in every age, tries modestly to assist men to make this contribution with Christian understanding, by showing them the relevance of Christianity to our world and by striving to bring them to the Christian faith.

I have said enough, probably too much, on this subject without trespassing on Mr. Tyler's preserves and will only add that it seems to me a tragedy that the number engaged on this work in the diocese of Sheffield is only four, all of whom are grossly overworked, and that funds, or the stimulus or, it may be, suitable men are not available to extend this great and vital work, not only in that diocese but also to every industrial diocese in the country.

I have left myself little time in which to deal with the employers' attitude, and looking back I am very conscious of the fact that it seems to have been accepted or implied in what has been said that it is only the employees who are need of a change of heart and attitude. Such is far from being the case. Indeed, it may well be, for all I know, that there still remain examples of the old type of manager, men who regard the workpeople as so many 'hands' and who, when they undertake measures designed to improve working conditions, health and comfort, or to prevent accidents, or to safeguard continuity of employment, do so because they are driven to it either by the law or by the force of public

opinion. Yet I firmly believe that very few such men remain and that the vast majority are men of good will who have definite ideals. They may not have them clearly defined in their minds : they may have the greatest difficulty in translating them from theory into practice and they may, and do, make grave mistakes in the attempt, but they have their ideals and they hold them sincerely. If ways could be found, first of convincing the whole of an organisation that the management is sincerely concerned for the well-being and contentment of all and, secondly, of gaining whole-hearted co-operation in the achievement of this objective, the problem would be well on the way to a solution.

In conclusion and in this connection I would like to give an extract from a series of what he called ' Talks ' which were written by my Chairman when, at the beginning of the last war, he assumed for a time the office which I now hold. These talks were called *Three Elementary Things*, and they were printed and circulated to everyone in the company who was in a managerial capacity of any kind. It would not have been surprising if they had been regarded as sheer sentiment by, at all events, many of the old-timers who had grown up under a very different philosophy of life but, in fact, they created a profound impression, which still endures.

This is the extract :—

> ' This talk is unorthodox. It is not about workmen: it is about men. It is also about ideals, because we must have ideals if we are to make full use of the special knowledge and experience that comes to us in our own spheres ; and, above all, we must have ideals about men. Again, I begin at the beginning. When the world was created, everything on it and about it was first made ready for man, that he might live and enjoy life, and not until then was man created. In the beginning, therefore, man was the most important thing on earth. He still is. And what is more, to each man, with few exceptions, this most important thing is himself. He wants to live and he wants to be happy : all his thoughts and all his actions are concentrated on these two things. What has this to do with industry? Everything. Industry is not composed of buildings and machinery — these are only tools. It is composed of a number of communities made up of men who spend their working lives together. And the daily lives of men cannot really be divided into two parts — one called Dreary Work and the other Eat, Drink and be Merry. Men are just as concerned to be alive and to be happy in their working hours as in any other hours of the day, and if they are to do their work well — as most men wish to do it — they must be well and they must be happy.'

HAS THE CHURCH FAILED SOCIETY?

By Sir William P. Hildred

WHEN Sir Henry Self asked me to give a paper at this Conference, I light-heartedly said yes — far too light-heartedly, as it turns out.

It was in his capacity as President of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and his knowledge that I wanted to be more closely associated with church matters in England, that led Sir Henry Self to suggest that I should attempt this address. A moment's reflection indicated to me that I had made a serious mistake. Any remarks of mine could only be the crackling of thorns under a pot. I am not a theological scholar; I am not a philosopher; I am not an historian. I am merely a seconded Civil Servant trying to run an association dealing with international air transport, about which avocation there is nothing divine.

I realized that I could only be personal and subjective. In order to define the terms, I am assuming that the Church means the Church in this country, or possibly the group of religious bodies in this country who, whether established or not, have the care of souls; and I am further assuming that Society does not mean what the *Tatler* means, but means rather the people as a whole. I hope I am not diverting from the theme if I recast the title by saying, 'Have the religious bodies in England failed in their duty to the people of this country?'

I have not a very reflective mind, but I see many things in pictures, and I would like to mention one or two experiences which I have had in the last year or two in flying about the world. The relevance of these snapshots may become apparent as I go on.

I have a picture of a cemetery called Forest Lawns, in Los Angeles. There it lay in the sunshine in that distant country. The lawns were beautiful and well kept. There was a life-size model of the little church at Rottingdean, another model of a wee Scottish church; and marble halls containing the remains of thousands of dead people. There were copies of classical pieces of sculpture and statuary; extracts from poems, from great prose works; and the thoughts of great writers inscribed on marble pages scattered about these same lawns. There was a chapel in which Leonardo da Vinci's 'Last Supper' done in coloured glass occupied the whole of one end, and a voice coming out of a mechanical apparatus spoke on religious themes; and the lights behind the coloured window faded and glowed, and faded and glowed as the voice spoke. At the end the lights diminished one by one, until

the last illuminated part of the picture was the head of Christ. I was introduced to the young man whose voice had come through the machine to us in the chapel. In one of the heavily-carpeted churches there was a bank of beautiful flowers, and quiet music came out of these flowers and, occasionally, the note of a bird came out of the flowers too. Two or three ladies were walking about in this church, and some of them were weeping. I believe the place I am describing has been made the subject of a book, which commented satirically upon it. I do not share that satire. I make no comment about its moral or spiritual value one way or the other. I reflected, as I came away, that there in that place were many beautiful things, copies it is true, which the people in Los Angeles could see day by day. They could not go to Italy or England, but there, copied for them, was beauty in line, in colour, in architecture, in great words, in poetry, even in music.

I turn to another personal experience. I am dining in the Restaurant del Orso on the banks of the Tiber. Rome is filled with a million people, all of whom possess small machines called Vespas which fly noisily round that incredibly lovely city. On the bank of the Tiber stands the Vatican, the Castle of Angelo, and the fine building of the Courts of Justice, all floodlit; a thousand years of history. We walk across the bridge towards the massive square of St. Peter's. It is filled with thousands of pedestrians and priests and pilgrims and cars. The cars are all hooting. They are hooting to induce the Pope to come to the window of his apartment and bless them. His window suddenly lights up and opens. The light goes out and the Pope, a little silver figure, stands in the opening with the light falling upon him. Many fall on their knees, hold up their rosaries, and receive his blessing. And the next day thousands watch the progress of the body of Pope Pius X through the streets of Rome for his canonization. My Roman Catholic friend tells me that this is an early canonization, as he only died on the outbreak of the first world war. He was canonized because many studies by the Cardinals of the nature and work of the man pointed in that direction. Miracles had been performed in his name. His body when the coffin was opened proved not to have corrupted; and that body was taken through the streets of Rome with the face and hands covered with silver. And traffic was quite impossible for many hours. I give you this picture without comment.

I turn to another picture, this time in England, when Billy Graham came here from America and preached in various stadiums and public places, drawing to his side thousands of people. I saw the crowds and I saw the many who, with varying degrees of

hesitation, got up at the end of his discourse and came towards him afterwards with a purpose in their minds. He made no claims and he made no criticisms. He spoke fairly of the help which had been afforded him by Church authorities and others. And one merely records that this young man, with his quick-fire utterance, had the power to induce a large number of people to go to a certain place, at a certain time, and devote a certain amount of their waking lives to listening to his discourse and taking, after it, some pledge to indicate that he had wrought upon their minds in some way. Again, I am making no comment.

I see other pictures of things I have experienced during the last few months, inanimate things, beautiful things. I see myself walking round the cathedral at Strasbourg at 12 o'clock in the moonlight; in Lincoln cathedral enjoying its beauty, its history and its line; in Peterborough, Norwich, Ely, doing the same thing; a book I brought from Strasbourg containing flawless photographs of the many cathedrals of France.

And I can see another picture in a village church, where a clergyman is introducing my first grandchild to the Church of England. I have attended christenings before, but this one had a personal interest; but I found as the service went on that this man had something far more than a wonderful voice. When he lifted the baby up and spoke the words which brought him to the Church, there was a definite emotional experience, a feeling of continuity. It was not possible to remain unmoved, and we felt that this clergyman had, in a manner denied to the rest of us, brought this child into a certain communion and set him on his feet.

Finally, I see a picture of the Coronation of the Queen, not only from a window in Piccadilly, but with a concurrent view of everything that was happening fore and aft going to the Abbey, in the Abbey, and coming from the Abbey. One could see the Prime Minister stopping his coach at the end of Piccadilly on the television set, and then see him out of the window a few minutes later smiling cheerfully as he went by. The abiding impression of that coronation was the deeply religious nature of the dedication of the Queen to the carrying out of her job, dedicated by the highest religious authority in the land. And this went to millions, thanks to modern science.

I have now finished with pictures and will address myself to the theme to which you have provoked me.

When I was born, there was little to do on Sunday except to go to church. Victorian habits and modes of life dictated that a young family would be marched to church whether they liked it or not, sent to Sunday School whether they liked it or not, and pos-

sibly to the evening service. There was in other respects a consciousness of the Seventh Day, indicated by not playing games, not reading certain books and by maintaining a certain gravity of demeanour.

Since then a materialistic age has invented the internal combustion engine and we have the motor-car; frigidaires and stored food; the radio valves and broadcasting; the U-tube and television; the modern press and methods of salesmanship; and, for the children, comic strips. The means by which people can attract the attention of other minds have developed in the last fifty years more than in the previous 5,000.

Whatever urge a man may have to spend some part of Sunday in going to church, his children, who know what other children do, think otherwise. Along with the development of an age of scientific materialism has grown a relationship between parent and child vastly different from that of fifty years ago. I am not arguing whether it is good or bad, but fifty years ago a father's word was law. To-day, even in an enlightened country like this, a father hasn't any word. His children will do what they want, they will make him do what they want; they regard him as a source of income and a bit of a bore. A man has a deeper relationship with his own son than any other man because in him he sees one hope of immortality. But it is not sufficiently remembered to-day that he also has a duty towards that son, to train him to live a good life as a civilized human being. It was overdone in Victorian times; it is underdone to-day; and parental dereliction of duty is partly responsible for our spiritual dilemmas.

The same age has produced better roads for motoring, greater facilities for getting about and sitting about, and the result, as far as Sunday is concerned, is that church-going is thrust into a corner. I know this is not the whole picture, but churches which can hold a thousand people have fifty at the morning service, and most of those are people past their first youth, many are lonely people, unwanted people, and sick people. There is nothing like a vague pain to remind a man of his Maker and send him, humbug that he is, to church.

When I say the church is 'thrust' into a corner, I mean in the mind of an ordinary man with an ordinary wife and car and family thinking on Saturday what he will do with Sunday. The majority to-day only go to church for weddings, christenings and funerals, and sometimes not even for those. Not only do they not go to church, they do not live their lives with any consciousness that the Church has much to offer. Materialism occupies the forefront of their minds; they think of economic stresses, of buying a larger

house and a larger car, a bigger television set, and keeping up with the Jones'; they plan their holidays seeking the solitude which a materialistic age makes necessary, but never finding it; and, in fact, putting up on their holidays with a degree of crowding far worse than their own small stamping ground at home.

In ages past in varying degrees, the amount of spiritual insight of the average citizen may not have been high. But I believe that the people living in England to-day are less Christ-like, in one important characteristic, than any generation over the last two thousand years. Sir Henry, in his article on Bishop Barnes, gave me the real keynote of what I want to say. He said, 'the uniqueness of Jesus was manifest in his unbroken consciousness of communion with God'. I accept that sentence and its meaning wholeheartedly. Christ was possibly the only soul who manifested in every waking hour a continuous and tranquil communion with God. But I think the generations who built the cathedrals in England and France had a pretty continuous communion with God. But since the tragedy of two world wars, coupled with the direct and massive attack of scientific cleverness and high-power salesmanship upon every home, there is less awareness of God, and less communion with God to-day than there has ever been. From eight in the morning till midnight the radio and television feed out news of what goes on in the world; and the people are attracted by the cleverness and success of temporal things and scientific gadgets. As soon as they have television, they are saying over their cocktails, 'it's time we had colour television'. It is a very sad remark.

King Alfred spent eight hours of the day in work, eight in sleep and eight in prayer. So he had a communion with God at a ratio of 33 per cent. I say the Lord's Prayer several times a day because, God forgive me, I have formed a habit of saying it in a taxi at a traffic light's stop, or when waiting for a lift or on any other of the occasions in modern life when time unaccountably stands still. I am doubtful of the moral propriety of using it as a therapeutic medium to treat a psychosomatic condition, but have no doubt of its efficiency. I don't know how other men pray, or where or how often. But the people living to-day are more taken up with assimilating the products of scientific research into their lives than ever before, and correspondingly less prone to think of eternal things; they are less in tranquil communion with God; less at home with nature and beautiful things. This is manifest in their works, new buildings, new towns, new airports, new music, new art, new poetry. And I do not think it is because I am sixty that I say it, but all new manifestations seem to be ugly and defeated and scrappy and vulgar. I travel a great deal and see many things.

To keep my eyes from getting sore (and perhaps more than my eyes) I have to look at the countryside and the cathedrals of England, at little churches, old villages, old paintings, and listen to old music, and to look at beautiful things made with hands. Compared with a simple craftsman of years ago, the modern quick-fire salesman pushing hysterically the latest gadget seems a sad and pointless creature whose life is not worth living. I've sometimes asked people, more as a dinner-table topic than anything else, 'If you were able to choose that your son at forty should have either made a million dollars or have become a powerful political force in his own country, or have written an imperishable and beautiful poem, which would you choose?' And many have nodded judicially and said, 'Let him make the money first and then write the poem'. Incredible people to think that a man could devote his working life to amassing pieces of paper with all that implies; and after a lifetime of ignoble effort devote the decaying remains of his intelligence to the creation of beauty.

But who am I to suggest that someone has failed. I merely record, as a simple mind, that whereas in the ages when they were building the cathedrals, or in the age of Elizabeth, or in the age of reason and elegance, the people lived lives in which religion and thoughts of a future life were a part of the minds and hearts of everybody, and that it is not so to-day.

There are far too many people in the world to-day whose lives are pointless; who jog from year to year, budget to budget, job to job, crisis to crisis, in a temporal medium, without one thought crossing their mind that they are here to live a good life and to think of a life beyond. And it is against this background, with its increasing ugliness, disorder, stridency, its ignoble buildings, ugly cities, and clever technical developments, that I ask myself the question, 'Has the Church failed the people?'

I am still not prepared to come up with an answer. I want to take a look first at the man who carries a large part of the responsibility — the clergyman of the parish church, the lowly man who lives amongst us and who can be our friend and guide. I recently attended an induction after saying goodbye to an incumbent I would like to multiply by a thousand. There was the Bishop in gorgeous vestments with his Archdeacon; other clergy, church wardens and a fair congregation. The new man makes certain declarations and is enjoined to help his congregation to become acceptable people in the sight of the Lord, to read the holy words of the Lord, to be a pattern to his flock, to teach in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, to bring people to baptism, to say public prayers in the house of the Lord, to study God's

Holy Word, to minister to the whole and to the sick, to celebrate the Holy Communion. He is given the keys of the church, touches the handle of the church door and enters into corporal and spiritual possession; in modern jargon, he is all set. The same induction service, however, reminds the congregation to pray for the minister, to assist him in his holy calling, to help him with their substance so that, being free from worldly anxieties, he may devote himself wholly to the preaching of God's word; to bear each their burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ. He then moves into a vicarage with twenty rooms, no heat, a large garden, a small stipend, no domestic help, and is left to raise his family on a shoestring. Spiritually, he is a fortunate man. In the sight of his congregation, his Bishop tells him to spend the rest of his life 'in continuous and tranquil communion with God'. He has to help other people to do so, but I am coming to that. His duty is a spiritual one; his daily medium is with a living church, a lovely building which he finds too empty. Economically he is not so lucky. Along with school teachers, university dons, the writers of music, young artists and young poets he gets very little money for his work. If he had gone into business as a high-power salesman, pouring technical products on to a receptive, inert public, or indeed into any of the jobs called into being by an age of scientific materialism, he could receive a lot more dollars. But he's made his choice, and that is that.

At the present moment, a mesmeric campaign is under way in a country I know of to sell millions of individual units for the cooling of individual rooms in apartments. With all the deadly purpose of a military campaign, the salesmen go forth to sell these objects to the public. They squat on window sills and cool the air by electricity. The public are treated to a campaign of persuasion with all sorts of inducements, and the campaign will succeed. The czars of the industry will then switch over to an even more powerful campaign to sell units which cool the whole apartment, and not just one room. It will take a year or two to get round to that, but you can see them soon turning off the pressure about the single units and bringing their power to bear on the larger unit; and a docile public will scrap the little units and buy the larger units. If the planning, campaigning, manpower and money that go into this affair were put into the Church of England, what would the result be? Forgive me for raising the question. But to-day every man is assailed with this high-power salesmanship, claiming every moment of his day, specifying every moment of his work and leisure, telling him exactly what to do in order to be a satisfied man and taking, of course, the bulk of his earnings in the process.

What chance has the spiritual minister whose ways are gentle, whose roots are in history and whose eyes are on the future?

There's the parson with his job to do and there's the man he has to do it with. And I ask again, has the parson failed the man, has the Church failed Society? Should the Church be doing more to help the people to have that continuous and tranquil communion with God and nature, which is the only thing which gives earthly life its meaning. I will try to give you, humbly enough, my answer. The Church is at present not succeeding in its duty. Whatever the circumstances, people don't go to church, they don't think much about eternal life, their lives are barren of communion with God. The Church is at present failing society, though not so badly as society is failing the Church, and nothing like so badly as society is failing society. That is the main sore, but I'm asked to deal with the first one.

It may be thought that in the snapshots I gave at the beginning I was searching for ways in which the Church might rearm itself for the fight with the material powers of to-day. But I cannot suggest that the Church in England should appeal to emotions by any modern commercial methods. I cannot suggest that the Church in England should try to impose faith on people by dogmatic assertions of what they must believe. Nor can I see lasting value in mass meetings, where large numbers are treated to a supercharged sermon. The effect is bound to be fleeting, and any steps the Church takes in looking after the people of to-day must take account of their collective personality. In England it is necessary to be moderate and not too dogmatic; and simple and clear and friendly.

Several matters affecting the contact between the Church and man occur to me where I do not claim to know the attitude of the Church, but I can say 'if'. If the Church of England is engaged in doctrinal quarrels, they should surely cease, for they dissipate the strength of able men and bore the lowly multitude who are ready to accept guidance if you can catch them; but ready to go elsewhere if you cannot. If the Church is trying to discipline the village clergymen, it should surely not do so. The clergyman should know his flock, and if he is willing to marry a divorced person he knows well to someone else he knows well, he should be free to do so. If he wants to give Holy Communion to any man, he should be free to do so. Pick your priests and trust them, and see that they do know the people of their parish. If the priest is asked whether this is indeed a piece of bread or something else he must, in my view, give an answer which he feels to be right and not be bound to give one in accordance with some canon imposed upon

him. But I really know too little of the authority of the Church in these things to comment upon them, and I would much rather finish by looking for a moment at the practical problem of how the parson is to find his congregation.

Knowing how people live and move to-day, is anything being done to have church services planned to catch them? Is anything done to follow them to their haunts in the countryside or the seaside; any exchange arrangements with clergy who are serving in places where people do go? How much is done to get hold of the young people in the Youth Clubs? Does every parish have something of that sort? Do all clergymen find out what books the children read, and are they ready to advise them by talks on books? Do they put something of communion with God into all the children of the parish? Do they attend secular functions in the parish so that they hear and are heard outside their own churches and pulpits? Do they link up with the Government and other schools in their parish, or are they kept out? Do they go to the factories and get to know the Personnel Officer and staff and the workers? Do they encourage local orchestras to play in their churches, and not depend for fifty-two weeks on the old organ? In the Welfare State, the channel of communication on all insurance matters is the local impersonal officer of the Minister of Labour and National Service. Do the parsons have anything to do with that; and, if not, could they? Or is the Welfare State rubbing out the human touch where parsons are concerned, just as it has done where family doctors are concerned? Do the clergymen try to do anything with the cycling clubs which start from their parishes, or flash through their countryside? Do parsons have any business at the local juvenile delinquent courts? Do they at every opportunity draw attention to the beauties of the places where they live, the flowers, footpaths, viewpoints, beauty spots, old buildings; and do they actually try to draw people to their church and parish by articles and photographs? Do they try to get hold of the cinema audience in their parishes? Is any effort being made to put religious themes into the form of small human documentary films? Do the parsons bear in mind the second half of the induction service and see that the people are asked to do something, so that every man and woman in the parish shares a collective responsibility? Here I have no hesitation in saying that they do not. Do the parsons do enough to create a community life in the parish with the church as its centre? They do not. Do they remind people sufficiently in simple words that the purpose of life is not money-getting and passive pleasures, but achieving communion with God and living wholly? I think not. I believe there are many things

the Church could do in the material circumstances of to-day which could actually be done without more money, more buildings, more manpower, though all these are wanted. So far as money is concerned, I think every factory should pay something to the local parson as the factory's spiritual adviser: and he should be welcomed about the factory, at coffee breaks, at staff conferences, at discussions about staff difficulties, marital and other human problems. None of this is doctrine. I am only trying to see how far the Church goes after the people; how far it reminds them of things they ought to do. If you can get hold of them, the problem is indeed half solved.

This prompts me to ask a question about the Modern Churchmen's Union. I know the Bible story of the handful of warriors who did not drink at the stream, which indicated the mighty potential of the chosen few. But I believe this body only has nine hundred members[1] in fifty-three million people. It is right enough that there should be an intellectual *corps d'élite* which can fight at a high level and engage in doctrinal controversy, and watch points of high policy. But what can be done with nine hundred? I think there should be a paying member of the Modern Churchmen's Union in every parish in the land. I don't know how many parishes there are, but it would be a start. I think members should pay higher fees and that each member should get two young people to be associate members, paying no fee. I don't want to be snubbed for talking out of turn, but if a drive is wanted in this direction, there'll be some lowly work to do drafting letters, sticking stamps on envelopes, and buying stamps. And I only mention it to say that I should be willing to do anything of that sort with a very good heart. If I cannot make any remarks of deep spiritual significance or join with you in metaphysical speculation and argument, I can perhaps, like the pupils of Mr. Squeers' Academy, spell 'window' and then go and wash one.

I recall a remark out of some book about the constitution of the rocks of the earth. The writer reminds us that man maintains his fragile life on a thin wafer balanced between a hellish morass and unlimited space. To look up or down is physically, but not spiritually, terrifying, and one can only reflect upon the unconquerable spirit of man. In misery, in happiness or in boredom, the countless generations will go on with increasing knowledge of the marvels of the universe; and the mighty works of God; and the most important thing in life is to ensure that each man lives fully and goes at last, reflecting that he has had a wonderful time on earth, into a future he believes in, ready and willing.

[1] The *Modern Churchman* has a much larger body of readers than the membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union and it also has a very wide and influential circulation.—EDITOR, *M.C.*

PRESENT TRENDS AND TEMPER OF SOCIETY

By Sir WILFRID GARRETT, late H.M. Chief Inspector of Factories

THE first thing that frightens me this morning is the title of my address. My only excuse is that I did not choose it, and I only accepted this invitation to address you after it was clearly understood that I would be allowed to deal with such present trends as are within my limited knowledge and comprehension.

How delightful it would be to hear some of our present-day philosophers really dealing with my subject. I presume they would start with the mechanistic and material conception of physical science as dealt with by Carlton J. H. Hayes in his *A Generation of Materialism*, lead up to the present-day humility of the great scientists since the introduction of the Quantum theory, the work of Einstein and the principles of probability and relativity. They would tell us of the great work of Julian Huxley and the improvement brought about in the human race by 'the tools of action and thought'. They would pass from these topics to the sense of insecurity brought about by the hydrogen bomb and would, perhaps, prophesy on the outcome of this gigantic force in peace and in war.

These, I presume, are the kind of propositions that should be discussed if my subject were handled properly, but all this is beyond me. I can only speak of those trends and tempers which affect the people I know, the ordinary people of all classes engaged in British industry. In numbers we make up such a large section of our population that we are of importance because of our very size, even if we are occasionally neglected because we are so often inarticulate. I ask leave, therefore, to look at the present trends of these people as far as they can be judged by one who has spent the whole of his life amongst them and not in looking down upon them from an ivory tower.

I am encouraged in taking this line by the fact that so much of our present conference is devoted to industrial topics. May I say at once that this indicates one of the trends of the last twenty years. We are now at last realizing that we are an industrial nation; in my middle life the miner never got into the news unless he went on strike, now he is news if he increases his production. Even the Universities have now clear ideas of the real value of our industries to the country as a whole, while, in my youth, anyone who even considered 'trade' was outside the pale.

In looking at the present trends and temper of the people with whom I am concerned, one is struck by the paradoxes one sees on every side. If we are influenced by some of our popular press, we

would conclude that the ordinary people of to-day have given up all idea of hard work and had lost all sense of security because they were sure that the forces that were guiding the world were too much for them. Politics are such that they cannot be influenced by anything we can do, the hydrogen bomb might be used on a side issue and project us into a world war. So we are prepared to throw in our hand and leave foreign affairs to Mr. Eden and income tax to Mr. Butler while we devote our time to filling in our pools and going to the 'dogs'.

Against this I see us taking our elections much more quietly certainly, but we do vote up to a percentage that surprises our American friends. In spite of our production having increased by over 80 per cent. by volume over pre-war figures, it is a trend of all of us to say that we are now not working. While this may be true of a few industries, I think two quotations will help to get our thinking straight. The first from a Cambridge friend whom I quote again later; he is working on the floor of a factory, and says that his mates work much harder than most middle-class folk imagine :

> 'It is our experience that laziness is not one of the workers' vices.'

The second is from Sir Walton Benton Jones, Chairman of United Steel Companies Ltd. :

> 'The assertion that the modern generation does not work as hard or as earnestly as previous generations is irritating to the industrious and fails to stimulate the lazy. Moreover, it gives a wrong impression to foreign buyers, but it is not true.'

When we look at the well-being of the present generation in our works, there can be no doubt of the improvements achieved. The poverty I saw in my youth has practically all gone and with it its consequences. One of the things we did well in the war years was to look after the physical well-being of our children to such an extent that the whole world admired our bonny babies. In consequence we have a better race to-day. A while ago I went into a Midland factory that I had known many years ago and, apart from the better conditions of work, the following points struck me most forcibly in a room where, on both occasions, boys and girls of from 16 to 22 made up the bulk of the workers. The young people of to-day are bigger and healthier, they looked more intelligent, they were better clothed and they were beautifully clean even at their work.

On the moral side, the paradox is equally great but is more difficult to understand. There has been a complete revolution in the way we now think of housing, the protection of old people and other activities of the Welfare State. Perhaps greatest of all has

been the change in our ideas as to the treatment of our children in our factories and mines, and in the training and education of our adolescents after they have gone to work. I am even prepared to admit that there was more sharp practice in business in the old days; there was certainly more petty thieving, as we can see from the pages of Dickens or in the life of Dr. Barnado. A few years ago I was interested in the London Docks, and I read somewhere that about 150 years ago it was estimated that 10,000 people lived principally by thieving from these docks. In the year in which I read this the number of people prosecuted for such pilfering was well under fifty.

But there was a difference; in those days we stole because we were hungry or because our children wanted food or boots, and we knew we were thieves; when caught we admitted we were thieves. This type of thieving has practically ceased, and in its place has grown up something on the scale of big business. One cannot rob cashiers returning from the bank, or steal vanloads of furs, nylons or cigarettes without considerable organizing ability; the battle with the police is part of this organization, and if caught, to one's comrades, one is just unlucky. In the taking of small things this new idea extends down to shop-lifting, and to the bits and pieces one lifts from the factory. My Cambridge friend says that one day his mate was down in the dumps through loneliness because his pal had had to go to gaol. On enquiring the reason, the answer was, 'He was unlucky over a few tyres'. The cause of all this seems to be that we have lost our sense of sin. Up to a few years ago we had some respect for the individual. We did not steal from the man who sold papers in the street or the old lady who sold us our sweets and cigarettes, but we did steal from the Services, from British Railways and from the larger firms. Now we seem to have lost all sense of the right of private possessions. A regular officer who took his battalion to Mons in 1914 told me that he had to force his men on to private fields and gardens to dig the trenches that were necessary to save their lives, but this year my friends tell me that they have lost cabbages and potatoes from their allotments, a rose tree from the front garden and a lawn mower from the back.

Perhaps the depth of this depravity and a hint of its cause is seen in a report that a headmaster of one of our public schools gave us in a lecture lately. He was speaking of two incidents that occurred to him within a short time of each other. In the London Club run by his school an apprentice pick-pocket said to him, 'Do you dare to tell me that if you saw something you wanted badly and you could take it without being found out that you would not take it?' and soon after in his study the parents of one of the boys

said, 'As to confirmation, we have no opinion either way, but if you think it will help his future career please make the necessary arrangements.'

To try and understand the causes of this present trend, I would like to consider more closely the facts revealed by my young friend whom I have mentioned previously. Both he and his wife took good degrees at Cambridge and then went into an industrial suburb of London and both took the first unskilled jobs offered to them by the Labour Exchange and took lodgings in the same neighbourhood. They found themselves in the new trades of our big towns which depend so much on automatic machines and routine labour. They discovered that they were in the midst of rank materialism hiding behind a façade of nice curtains and clean rooms but with the old community spirit of the slums entirely missing. In the old days, if there was a wedding or a funeral in the street, everybody helped to make the show a success. They found that the past fashion of running in and out of one another's houses had quite gone. The attitude towards marriage and the family was, in my friend's words, 'just poisonous'. The main reason seemed to be the numbness of mind imposed by this life of work unrelieved by any higher outlook whatsoever either in the home or at work.

Explanations that might be put forward for this unhappy state of affairs in this particular environment may be:

(1) These conditions exist chiefly in our very large towns where the people are cut off entirely from nature and the discipline of a small community. The countryman, and even the small town dweller, has a culture and discipline of his own; the miner (a village or small town dweller) has to a large degree a highly developed social and political sense.

(2) Both the employers and the employed in this type of work have been slow to develop a sense of organization. The employers are often outside the influence of the great revolution in management that has taken place in the last twenty years and the workers are to a large extent outside the influence and the community spirit of the Trade Unions.

These arguments may suggest that, up to now, I have overemphasized the seamy side of our life. I am not suggesting that the majority of our population live like this or think like this. I am only saying that there is a certain percentage that do so think and live, that these people are not confined to one class and that the canker appears to be spreading. To me the cause of this spread is the fact that we are living on our religious capital, and if the deterioration continues we may lose not only our freedom but also

the physical well-being that has grown with our idea of Christian democracy.

Indeed, as I thought on this side of our life I was struck again by the paradox of the situation. During the last fifty years I have seen at close quarters the immense improvement in industrial conditions. I have seen the leaders of capital and labour come together and work together in spite of all that is said to the contrary. I have seen about me a nation of happier young people. I see less make-believe and less snobbery, less bitterness in national politics, and the bitterness of religious controversy has almost entirely disappeared. Fewer people go to church, but those that do go are of a higher Christian standard both in the pulpit and in the pews. But I think this has come from a more enlightened outlook of our leaders, based on a truer vision of Christian democracy, and I am troubled that we may lose this vision if we fail to hold on to our moral standards.

If time allowed, it would be interesting to consider fully the causes of these conditions, but I can only touch on a few. Personally I trace much of our troubles back to the time of the industrial revolution, when the demand for cheap labour in the new factory towns forced thousands into those towns and gave us not only the conditions we read of in our history books, but also broke up, once and for all, the old conditions of the parish and the hold of the community spirit of the village and the church on the behaviour of the people. In spite of the effort of the Church to follow the people into these towns, it failed, not because it failed to provide the buildings or even the men, but because it was overwhelmed by the climate of opinion of the age. The new economics of *laissez-faire* was accepted by all as a law of nature, and for the first time our world was separated into secular and religious, and the former won.

That we recovered at all, as we undoubtedly did, was due to many influences. The new ideas of science and liberal thought, tempered by the work of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, reacted on public opinion which in turn forced political action in matters of health, education and industrial legislation. On the great majority of the nation, however — the workers in the new factories and the mines — perhaps the greatest reaction of all was the influence of the Wesleys on the first leaders of the new trades unionism. This new development came into being from fifty to a hundred years after the Wesley revival, and the first leaders were drawn from the pulpits of the chapels of the North and West. These men gave to the new movement that honesty and straightforwardness which it still retains and makes it still the envy of the rest of the world.

One has only to go abroad to see what this means, though we may now call its qualities by quite other names. I am still optimistic enough to think that if any serious crisis arises that is likely to break us away from the quiet and sound march of the British people towards real progress, it will be handled and stopped by the latent puritanism of our miners and factory operators of the West and North.

The next set-back that I recognize came from the first World War. I think the trouble was that so many of us left our personal faith behind us in the trenches of Ypres and the Somme, with the bodies of the best of our generation, the men who should now be the leaders in all branches of our national life.

Perhaps the outstanding manner in which this loss of faith has shown itself has been in our failure to mantain our home life. While we must not forget that happy homes in abundance are still one of the shining examples of our civilization, we cannot ignore the fact that divorce and the break-up of families have greatly increased during the last thirty years, and I do not think that any of us who have come from good homes are able to realize the dreadful effect on a sensitive child of the loss of security that comes from a broken home. A few years ago a friend of mine undertook a mission at one of our prisons and found that, as far as he could ascertain, over 90 per cent. of the inmates came from broken homes where the break had occurred before the child was four years of age.

On the physical side we need more houses to help the many decent people who want to set up one of these happy homes but cannot get the actual house in which to do so. But to be fair to ourselves I should add that an Indian friend of mine who has studied housing in several countries of the world has assured me that we are better housed than any other nation in the world, but even this does not excuse any neglect of what is probably the most serious problem facing industrial society to-day.

From the second World War loss of a sense of security has come upon us in full force. I remember as a youth thinking how out-of-date we were to continue praying in the Litany for deliverance from battle and murder and from all sedition, privy conspiracy and rebellion, and I also remember being taught that Christ's words about wars and rumours of wars must have referred to the coming destruction of Jerusalem with the implication that they had nothing to do with us. We were then secure and established, but, as someone has said, established thought is for established souls and so many of us now, from the hordes of refugees to the house-hunter, are disestablished souls all too

conscious of Berber's words, 'Nothing remains but what rises above the abyss of to-day's monstrous problems', and we are beginning to think with Berdyaev that 'freedom is difficult, whereas slavery is easy'.

On the religious side we see a wide rebellion against traditional theology and authoritarian thinking. We see this in French existentialism, which is a revolt against those things which seem to be outside the battle of life as we now see it. Many laymen of to-day think that the authority of the Church is outside reality, that it sits up above and judges but does not enter into life; that authority, whether of Church or State, is inclined to ask of any given situation, 'does it conform to the correct dogma', while we want to know 'does it work'.

Though this line of thought is all very depressing, I am optimistic enough to think that we are nearing a trend in the opposite direction, and my hope lies in a certain section of our young people. Since my retirement I have had for a few years the opportunity of living with a small cross-section of a type of young person of about the ages of eighteen to twenty-five that I have found most refreshing. Roughly, these young persons can be classed as of apprenticeship standard; though they have not all served an apprenticeship, they all have the necessary I.Q.'s that would enable them to do so. They have all profited by the training that is now given by most of the large firms and the nationalized industries, as many of them have previously profited by the excellent training in the top form of our technical and grammar schools.

Whilst there are amongst them even more than the average percentage of professing Christians, they are still the product of this scientific age. They believe they can be happier and lead fuller lives in a scientifically controlled world; they know that the present standard of living of us all depends on their production. They have all been told that the bishops voted against the emancipation of slaves, but they know little of Shaftesbury, nothing of Wilberforce, of the Evangelical revival, or of the Oxford Movement.

Yet a considerable number of them now have doubts of where scientific methods of a certain type are leading us. They are beginning to appreciate that knowledge without wisdom leads to the atomic bomb, that humanism in its logical end leads to the labour camp. Their sense of fair play still comes to the top based on our old religious tradition, and on the culture that still largely revolves round the chapel, the Co-op. and the miners' lodge.

They are very suspicious of organized Christianity, but they have no suspicion of Christ. They accept His tenets to a remarkable extent, but most of them have difficulty in believing that He is

still alive and can be a help to them to-day in their individual lives. In this state of society I see our greatest hope, and we should work for the extension of the privileges now enjoyed by so few. Unfortunately, of the 300,000 boys and girls leaving school at 15 each year, only 27 per cent. of the boys and 8 per cent. of the girls are released by their employers to attend part-time day classes. I suppose we must wait for the County Colleges that will extend this privilege to all, and meanwhile should support the great work done in our technical colleges and other schools towards the broadening of the outlook of these young people.

And lastly, what can the Church do to help in all these matters? There is considerable thought now being given in all the churches as to how best we can heal this division between the secular and the religious sides of life. The job, as I see it, is to give us all confidence in life and, as we are an industrial nation, that must come in our having confidence in an industrial civilization. This will require assurance of the ultimate meaningfulness and worth of human life, a personal morale and working faith and active confidence that life is worth living. When I see so many strong people amongst managers, trade unionists, foremen and workers doing so much to restore this confidence and to shoulder the necessary responsibility, I shrink from saying that the Church should go in to help these people. As I believe that the advance in many directions within industry has lately been greater than that in many other sides of life, I would rather suggest that the churches may have something to learn from industry, because in many trades union branches, in many factories and especially in many rooms of particular factories one often finds a better community spirit than one finds outside.

So I want the churches to send in men who will help to bridge this frontier between these two sides of our national life. Even to learn to speak the same language again will require an immense effort, and a still greater effort is necessary for each side to see what the other is getting at.

We have industrial chaplains in several industrial areas and establishments, and many of them are doing good work. Still, the best results must come from planting more and more Christian men and women on the floor of the shop. There are, therefore, two experiments going on which I would like to see developed and expanded. The first is that volunteer ordinands who purpose to work in industrial areas should be given the opportunity of working for at least six months on the floor of the shop, living with their mates and entering into their trades union and other activities. The other is that young men and women who have the true missionary

spirit should, after some training, go deliberately into work on the shop floor and stay there for some years. Experiments of both types are already in being, but time will not allow me to consider the details that must be worked out for both plans. I can only ask for their consideration and would prefer to speak shortly of the Christian stuff that, in my opinion, must be there before these or any other plans will succeed.

As an example, in meeting the young people I have already mentioned we must first of all be fair to them, be prepared to learn all the exigencies of their life and something of their history and their background. We must learn to talk to them about their own interests and to be at ease with them; be prepared to trust them as men and as equals, men whose point of view must be taken seriously even if we cannot always agree with it. While a training in theology will be of immense help to these missionaries they must not talk theology, they must go for their example to Christ who could be at ease with everybody, the woman at the well, and little Zacchaeus. He was no snob in thinking only the poor needed help; He spent a whole night with Nicodemus, He went to Matthew's feast, and that was no mothers' meeting; He was the only one left in the room with the woman taken in adultery. He was nearly thirty years a carpenter to show the dignity of all work. Finally, He gave us that frightening lesson in the upper room that real leadership can only come from humility. 'Ye call me master and lord, *for so I am*,' and to do this perfectly I must take on the work of a slave and wash your feet.

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRY

By the Rev. L. G. Tyler, M.A., Rector of Christ Church, Bradford, Manchester

IF you have lived under the shadow of a factory, you will soon realize that a factory has a life all of its own. At different times of the day shifts come and go; raw materials are carried in, finished products are moved away. The factory is probably the biggest building in the locality; it often creates dirt and smells. Within is its own hierarchy, managers and technicians, clerical staff and workmen, foremen, shop stewards, charge hands and men, all interdependent in the most mysterious way to the eyes of a mere outsider. Industry is a world of its own, but it is a world made up of men and women who are largely an enigma to those whose own lives have not been cast within the shadow of the factory. There are vast numbers of people in this country who have no idea of what life in industrial society is like. It is true that people often gather impressions or give vent to sweeping generalizations about industry and those who work within it; there is, however, little real knowledge and often little real sympathy for the problems of our industrial society, a society, it must be remembered, which not only maintains our standard of living in this country, but has proved itself an indispensable life-line in times of war, and whether we like it or not, can still produce the greatest political and social problems of our age.

Fifty years ago, and even less, the social conscience of Christians was roused to do something about the conditions in the slums of our big cities. 'One half of the world did not know how the other half lived' it was said. The same is still true in relation to our industrial society, and there is room in the Church to-day for a real Christian concern with the challenge which this creates. It is not now merely a matter of social justice or of philanthropy, but of bringing the creative Christian insights to bear on a situation which is perplexing in its secularity and complexity.

That is why, during the last fifteen years, and increasingly since the end of the war, the Church in this country has awakened to the problems which arise when she has to witness to her faith in the midst of industrial society. This is supremely an issue for the English Church, for although it is not our exclusive concern, we have a longer industrial history than any other country in the world, and our status as a nation depends almost entirely upon our industrial achievement. I believe that many people are now beginning to realize that the Industrial Revolution was not merely an economic event, but that it brought about a change in our mode

of life and habits of thought as extensive as the influence of the Renaissance in the sixteenth century. Certainly it is clear that when Christians in industrial society try to think out their strategy, they can no more appeal to precedent in Christian history than could their forbears in the faith who had to relate the gospel to a society profoundly disturbed and altered by the claims of the New Learning.

I cannot stress this point too firmly, for unless we recognize the vastness of the problem of industrial society and the radical way in which it strikes at the roots of contemporary life and culture, we shall only be guilty of dabbling, and there has been enough of that already. There is a great danger that every Christian body and group of philanthropists will turn to industry as a happy hunting ground because it is a fashionable concern; it would be fatal if the Church were to make such a naïve mistake. Anyone who has lived in the great industrial towns of this country knows that the problems of industry are far greater than merely those of 'industrial relations'. The Industrial Revolution has proved to be one of the great conditioning forces in our economic and social history. There is no precedent in Christian history to which we can appeal to aid our understanding. It is a duty laid by God upon His Church now that we should think out and experiment with the ways in which the gospel can be effectively proclaimed in Industrial Society.

It may seem a strange thing to say, but I believe that in no small measure our difficulty is increased by the fact that industrial society has never been fully accepted in this country. Industry has often been regarded as a regrettable necessity; people made money in industry so that they might retire away from it; children were given education so that they might get a job which took them out of the industrial machine; no one who worked in industry, at however high a level, was regarded as a professional man — a title which was reserved, and sometimes still is by many people, for those who did what was regarded as professional work six hundred years ago. For many, the factory was the place where people worked; their real life was centred somewhere else; in the respectable suburbs if your income made that possible, or in the pub and in your home nearby if your income was not large enough to enable you to live away. It was this fact which accounted for the drab rows of industrial workers' cottages in the new towns of the nineteenth century, whilst the mill-owners made themselves as comfortable as they could as far away as was practical. In the Middle Ages, work had been done for the greater glory of God or for the sake of the craft; but the industrial revolution soon put an

end to all that; it provided but little opportunity for real creative expression; men valued industry for the material gain it brought them, and for little else. It was exceptional for there to be any social intercourse between those who employed and those who were employed. There is little doubt that many present problems of labour relationships are a legacy from the bad old days when management and labour had a basic emotional attitude which was not one of creative partnership, but of hostility, and neither side could see in industry anything more than a means to an end — an end which they may not always have been able to define very clearly, but about which all were agreed that it lay outside industry itself. Fortunately, there are signs of improvement in many of the big modern industries into which university graduates are recruited, where apprenticeship courses are run with real vision and enlightenment and where welfare and cultural services are provided so that men can be used fully and creatively without unnecessary frustration in their daily work. I believe that Christians ought to support every movement of this kind, but there is no point in concealing from ourselves that such opportunities are far from universal, and that the legacy of the past still moulds the pattern of much industrial work.

When the Christian Church takes the gospel to the mission field, her missionaries, priests and teachers have to make a real effort to understand the culture and environment within which they seek to proclaim the faith. It is clear that the New Testament writers and the early fathers did the same in their work of apologetics. The Industrial Revolution created a mission field on our own doorstep, for it brought into being a new environment with a new type of man, who no longer worked for the glory of God or for the sake of the craft, but whose life was caught up in a new pattern of relationship which became increasingly complex as industry expanded.

I would like to attempt to analyse some of the factors which contribute towards the making of our modern 'industrial man'. We should remember that it is this section of the community which the Church finds it so hard to bring in any significant numbers within its fellowship.

(1) *Industrial man is mass produced and mass producing.* One of the by-products of the Industrial Revolution has been a great increase in population. Vast, amorphous towns grew up in the course of a few decades. Whereas previously men had lived in small communities, now they were grouped together in a mass society, and it is quite clear that in spite of the great spate of church building in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century,

the Church never really kept pace with the spiritual needs of the new population. The parish church was not the focal point of the community life, and the Church of England never really established its roots with any firmness amongst the industrial workers. There are certainly many instances where faithful parochial work was done, but the Church as a whole was unable to help people to make sense of the rapidly expanding industrial society, so that it is true to say that the main life of industry and the complex human problems which arise within it were isolated from real Christian influence. The result is that now whole blocks of the industrial population are outside the orbit of the Church.

Working-class society was never viciously anti-clerical in Britain as it tended to become in other countries, but people bred and born in an industrial environment conformed to the accepted pattern of life, which was less and less influenced by significant Christian convictions. Men who do the same work, who live in the same houses under similar conditions, whose lives are exposed to the same economic and political forces, who become increasingly conscious of their class and of their group loyalties, conform inevitably to a type. Anyone who has worked as a parish priest or as a social worker amongst one section of the community recognizes this fact. There is a monotonous likeness between individuals in their behaviour, reactions, interests, and even dress and appearance. This has important consequences for the Church's evangelistic work, and I shall return to it in a moment.

(2) *The basic insecurity of the worker.* You do not need to discuss social conditions with a representative of the working class for very long before you are forcibly reminded of the unemployment of the thirties. In this era of full employment, many of us tend to forget the widespread unemployment of the years before the war. There are thousands of men in this country, not yet sixty, who can remember the best part of twenty years out of work, or at the most partial unemployment. When we are impatient with increased wage demands, threatened strikes and industrial absenteeism, we ought not to forget this background of economic insecurity. Can we really blame men who, when we think they are acting irresponsibly to society, reply that they feel they are acting as responsibly as society treated them and their class in the years of depression? This is a psychological factor in many trade disputes which we need to bear in mind. It is true still that many industrial workers feel that they have no permanent security. They know that they are often the first to be declared redundant if there is even a temporary trade recession, so that it is hardly surprising that they adopt an attitude of feathering their nest whilst they

can and living for the moment. When the Church speaks of things which have eternal significance, and of a man's duties to God and to his neighbour, we ought not to forget how easily these things can seem irrelevant to anyone whose preoccupations are with his work and his wage.

(3) *The drabness of industrial society.* Great improvements have been made in recent years in the general standards of living of the industrial worker in this country. It is, nevertheless, still true that the vast majority live under conditions of appalling drabness. Dirt, inadequate housing, lack of recreational facilities all contribute to a frame of mind which is inimical to the highest potentialities of life which the Christian seeks to foster in God's name. Christians ought to be in the forefront of all kinds of social reform and agitation, in both local and national government, which will make the places where people live less drab and more suitable as centres where individuals and communities can exercise the creative faculties God has given them. 'God made the country, but man made the town' may be a pious saying, but it contains a truth sufficiently large to sharpen the conscience of many a person in this land. The sort of culture which the Church should seek to propagate is vitiated by the appalling drabness and dirt of the typical industrial area in which people have to live. Human needs are frequently sacrificed to the requirements of industrial development; such questions as inadequate housing, playing fields, better educational facilities, smoke abatement and atmospheric pollution are basically moral issues, and Christians should do everything within their power to stimulate public opinion at every level in these matters. Drab and inadequate living conditions must inevitably produce dull minds and insensitive spirits.

(4) *Work is regarded as an evil.* The general answer to the question 'Why work?' is, of course, the pay packet. For the majority, the only interest in work is the financial reward it brings. Work in itself is an evil to be got through, not something which can evoke a pride by being well done. That is the value industrial society has set upon work. Work is something which a man does to enable him to maintain his real life elsewhere. It is, however, foolish not to acknowledge that a man's working time is indeed part of his real life. It conditions his outlook for a large proportion of his day. In some industries it is possible to tell what a man's job is merely from observing his behaviour and appearance; his job moulds him. It is a matter of urgency that the Christian Church should help men to hold a true doctrine of work: man's share in the creative purposes of God; his discharge of his skill for the well-being of the community; a man's work as the instrument through

which he expresses himself as a creative personality made in the image of God, and by which he discharges part of the two basic duties of his life, his service to God and to his neighbours. It is not enough to ask men to be honest and thorough in their work; they must be helped to a true understanding of it, not as a temporary expediency but, like all important human actions, as something of eternal consequence.

(5) *The spiritual and cultural poverty of industrial life.* Never before in the whole history of our industrial life have the workers in industry enjoyed such a high standard of living. Christians can rejoice that the Welfare State has remedied many of the abuses under which previous generations had to live.. Improved maternity and child welfare services have reduced the bogey of infant mortality; better educational facilities have opened fresh opportunities to sections of the community previously unable to obtain them; medical services and insurance schemes have made life better for the masses of the people and, no doubt, amongst those to benefit most is the industrial population of this land. There is a greater measure of social justice in Great Britain than ever before. Christians must be thankful for these achievements, and I believe we ought to encourage more Christian men and women to enter the social welfare services and bring all the essential insights of their faith to bear in making them work more efficiently and personally for the well-being of the community. The welfare services provide what is really a form of pastoral work. We ought not to lament that this sort of philanthropy has been taken from the Church, but to rejoice that it can now be done more thoroughly on a scale with which the Church could never cope.

One great achievement of the Welfare State has been that it has exposed the real nature of the basic poverty of contemporary civilization, especially in our industrial areas. 'Man shall not live by bread alone'; he is still hungry and lost when it has been provided. The Christian can see that the Welfare State has revealed the real poverty of our human situation. It is the poverty of men who have no values; of men who assess goodness not by the laws of the God who made them, but by the expediency of the moment in which they find themselves; the poverty of men in whom pride and selfishness and lust still reign; the poverty of men who know not where they are going because they have not been shown the way; the poverty of men who are bewildered when they pause to think about the great problems of human life. The Welfare State provides these treasures which men seek to lay up for themselves, but it remains for the Church to teach that moth and rust corrupt these treasures, and that thieves break through and steal

them. The real welfare of man undoubtedly includes all these treasures of earth, but he needs, too, the gifts of faith, which neither moth nor rust can corrupt and which no thief can break through and steal. The Church's proclamation of the gospel, the demonstration of her life in prayer and sacrament and fellowship, is the means whereby our Lord feeds his hungry children and enables them to walk with confidence in the midst of a bewildering world. Men's eyes need constantly to be lifted upwards if they are not to perish; they need a vision which goes beyond the confines of their natural existence On becoming a Christian a man is forced to extend his sympathies and range of interests far beyond the limits of his own inclination, as he learns to see the whole world as the object of the creative and redemptive love of God. Modern industry moulds men into a narrow rut of vision and interest; the Christian Faith lifts them up to God that they may share the fullness of His life.

(6) *The problem of the industrial labourer.* We have already noticed something of the limitation of life which modern industry imposes upon those who are engaged within it. Increasing numbers of people are called for whose job is merely to mind a machine. No skill is demanded and the operation can be learned in a few minutes. The men and women engaged in these techniques are really unskilled labourers, often of low intellectual calibre. It is, therefore, little wonder that people employed in this way are satisfied with the crudest pleasures of life, and I believe that the Church has to give much more attention to the ways in which a bridge of communication can be built across to this largely unexplored and unknown territory. It is easy to say that 'there is a light which lighteneth every man' and that men can be brought to faith if they are approached with sympathy and patience. Unfortunately, the problem is more intransigent than that, and the Church of England needs to give more serious attention to the training of men, ordained and lay, who can do the pioneering work in this sphere. It is not very attractive socially, and it makes great demands upon those who undertake it, but there is a great sphere of evangelistic work here which, if it were properly tackled, would be of the utmost significance. Nothing will happen until there is a much greater conscience and sense of urgency of mission within the Church. We must never allow ourselves to be content with only a suburban bourgeois Church.

(7) *The Alienation of the Church from the Industrial Worker.* So much has been said and written about this aspect of the problem that there is no need for me to discuss it here. It is patently true that the Church has the slenderest roots in the life of the industrial

community. There is hardly any active opposition to the Church; on the contrary, there is an immense amount of good-will both for the Church and her clergy. This is much better than the situation in other European countries, where there is often active hostility, although the gap between the Church and industrial society is enormous even in our own country. We must realize how far contemporary industrial man, especially at the lower levels of industry, is removed from being actively identified with the worship and way of life of the Church.

In so far as the working man thinks about the Church at all, he sees it on the other side of the fence from where he stands. It represents another class, not necessarily one he hates; his circle is outside it; it is the done thing for his group not to go to church, and he is seldom prepared to break with the commonly accepted practices of his mates. He identifies the Church with the suburbs, with a different way of life and a different kind of speech. He knows that the lay people who serve in the councils of the Church are not drawn from his class. If he remembers anything about religion at all, he thinks of it as a pious moralism, at the most all right for the wife and kids, but not really of much significance for the world in which his life is set. I believe that this fact, which if anything I have understated, constitutes the greatest challenge to our Church, and I would like to see as much attention given to it in our theological colleges and post-ordination courses as is given to the recruiting and training of men for service overseas.

So far I have tried to break down under various heads some aspects of the problem of the relation of the Church to industrial life. I have confined myself to the personal aspects of the situation because they are the ones which strike me in my daily work as a parish priest. The Christian gospel has many things to say about justice and right relationships within industry, but I believe that clergy should be careful how they speak on these matters, for modern industry is so complex that an intimate knowledge of its working and of its real problems are necessary if we are to avoid giving the impression of merely uttering rather pious platitudes of an impractical kind. I would refer you, however, to an admirable address given by the Archbishop of Canterbury in September last year in Manchester, entitled 'The Task is Yours'.[1]

The present situation is, I believe, full of possibilities. There is no need for undue pessimism, and one of the most encouraging signs is the readiness with which people at all levels in industry, recognizing that things are not what they ought to be, are prepared

[1] Published by The Industrial Christian Fellowship, price 6d.

to consider afresh the insights of the Christian Faith. If all over the country we have got groups of Christians who are alert to the situation — and I believe this is happening more rapidly than is sometimes realized — I am sure that it is not too late to give a new direction, not only to a social process which has gone on since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, but also to the lives of many men and women who are at present frustrated and misdirected because they are in need of God and His Church.

We do not want the industrial scene to be treated as a fishing pond from which we catch more individuals into the life of our churches. Our whole standard of living so much depends upon industry that we must see the men and women working in it not just as souls to be brought to repentance and faith, but as members of a very complex and essential society which must be brought as a whole to serve the purposes of God. I cannot agree with those who would advocate a return to a kind of mediaeval craftsmanship and who regard modern industry as a gigantic evil. It has to be, if the world's standard of living is to be maintained and developed; it is our duty to give it the spirit of consecration which enables it to exist for the greater glory of God.

Some people would appear to over-simplify the issue of Christian evangelism. A reading of Christian history would suggest that the really significant advances by the Church have been made when whole societies and groups have been drawn into her fellowship. This is not to disparage the importance of every individual person or the implication of a truly converted life, but there is a solidarity about human life which exists in the natural order as much as it does within the Church, and a man cut off from his group and from the mates with whom his life is expressed is, in a profound sense, an incomplete conquest. This often happens when a working man joins the local church, for it means stepping out of the fellowship of his workmates, with whom, under God, so much of his life is intimately bound. Christian strategy ought to recognize this problem. It is impossible that there will be any significant evangelism unless we not only think of industrial man as an individual but also as a member of a group, and a very important one, with which the Church must establish significant contact. Much zealous but misdirected Christian effort goes into the conversion of individuals to the neglect of the groups to which those individuals belong. A religion of mere individual piety will never be adequate to our task, and I sincerely hope that in the future more effort will be given, than has been in the past, to the task of baptizing not only individuals but whole groups into the Christian Faith. This, as I see it, has been the significance of the Bishop of

Sheffield's industrial mission in our own country and of the *prêtres ouvriers* in France. The achievements and difficulties of these two important pieces of Christian strategy reveal the vastness of the task of what can be glibly called baptizing society and the fact that the finest qualities of devotion, perseverance and vision are required if it is to be done successfully. The initiation of such work is comparable to any of the great pioneering movements in Christian history, and those who undertake it must not be surprised if the whole of the Church does not share their vision and concern. I believe that we shall increasingly come to see that repentance and faith, the two responses which the preaching of the gospel seeks to evoke, can only be fully realized when it is possible for the individual to complete his penitence and faith within a corresponding corporate movement which arises from the group to which he is bound. That is surely what the expression 'Christendom' implied, and our strategy as Christians to-day must be such that it is clear that when we speak of evangelism we mean much more than persuading others to a religion of personal pietism. Our concern must be with the new Christendom.

At the moment, many experiments are being made in the industrial sphere. Chaplains and laymen are working in many dioceses; groups of men and women are meeting in different centres thinking out the implications of the Christian Faith in relation to their own situation; we have ordinands and others working within industry on the shop floor; some Christians are deliberately choosing to live and work in industrial society with a real sense of vocation; amongst the parochial clergy more and more men in the industrial areas are coming to realize that many of the traditional pastoral techniques of their ministry are inapplicable to their people and that new emphases are called for. All this concern is surely an outworking of the Holy Spirit, and we should give our prayers and interest to it.

Finally, I should like to conclude with some observations on the practical contributions which the Church can make to living in this industrial age. Very often clergy and others seem disillusioned and cynical about the difficulties of their work and witness in these areas. Whilst I am the last person to minimize the vastness of the problem, I believe that we should face this task with confidence and hope and with a profound gratitude that we have now more people in the Church with a sympathetic and informed understanding of this mission field than at any other time since the beginning of the Industrial Era.

The Christian gospel is never likely to make a cheap or popular appeal, for it insists on such qualities as unselfishness, responsi-

bility for oneself and others, and it demands a life of continual moral endeavour, not as works of human achievement, but as the flowerings of our response to the grace of God. This has quite practical consequences, and every parish church and Christian group must plan to help its members to make these realities. The total impact of the Church in its semi-pagan environment will be made by the vitality of the life of the Body of Christ. Wherever the Church exists, certain things will characterize her mission; the concern with the problems of home and family life; an insistence on standards of honesty in work and personal dealings; the exercise of a responsible attitude in the discharge of social and public duties; the readiness to serve our fellows voluntarily in whatever ways are at our disposal. In these ways Christians will often find themselves co-operating with others who do not share the presuppositions of their faith. Such co-operation has its problems and raises inevitable tensions, but it is essential that Christian men and women should be prepared to accept responsibility wherever they can bring their judgment and influence to bear, whether it be in the Trade Unions, political parties, employers' and trade federations or in local government. Christian insights are often lacking on many burning questions because Christians are not there to make them, and we are often out of touch with the issues which vex men's minds because we are not represented in the real areas of conflict and tension. As far as industry is concerned, the Church has abdicated too long from her right to reveal the light of God's Word of judgment and mercy. The local Christian community must be the place where prophets are trained for their work of witness. Surely it is right to maintain that all effective Christian witness must contain a prophetic element, and this is no less necessary for modern industrial society than it has been at any previous period of Christian history. We recognize the place of the Church in the field of education and of healing; I can see no reason why within the next few years the work of those who are at present pioneering for the Church in the realm of industry may not have established a similar place in what remains for the moment a mission field in which we are increasingly learning to find our way.

The Church of God is in the world of history to make men whole. The good news of salvation offers men a wholeness which embraces them in body, mind and spirit. One of the most disintegrating influences in our society is the Leviathan of the industrial age, and we have to learn how to make men whole in Christ's name in spite of the forces which are ranged against us. There is something about modern industrial society which is comparable

to the 'principalities and powers and spiritual wickedness in high places' against which St. Paul once felt himself ranged. That is why this task of industrial evangelism calls for consecretion of mind and heart; it is a gigantic task, and we can only undertake it when we have fully measured up to its enormity and laid hold on the resources God makes available to us.

Many people would agree with the practical ethical implications of the Christian Faith, and I have left to the end of this paper the subject which underlies all that has been said about Christian living in our contemporary industrial community. The worship of the Church is not a pious religious exercise for the well being of a man's soul; it is not even to be justified as an activity which provides strength and inspiration for a man's work in life. Christian worship is the means whereby our life is directed in its wholeness towards God, our problems and anxieties, our achievements and our joys. In worship, our little vision, bounded as it is by the restrictions of this world, is brightened so that we begin to see more clearly how all things in time and eternity hang together in God's hand. Our world is in anguish because we are too small, and the problems of industry are but part of the world's pain. Too many little men confronted with too big problems. The movement of worship is the action of paltry human lives offered to God, in order that He may hand them back consecrated in His service. This worship is the work of a lifetime, and as we enter into it, we learn to see the tasks of the moment in the light of all eternity.

CASTING THE FIRST STONE—CRIME AND THE MORAL OUTLOOK

By Walter Raeburn, Q.C., M.A., LL.M.

THE subject which I am proposing to discuss is crime. That is an ugly word. It implies that the offender is a criminal; that is to say, a creature morally degraded, untrustworthy, doubtfully employable and a social outcast. He may be a murderer, a burglar, a swindler, a sexual pervert, a tipsy motorist or a half-wit who exposes himself to children in a park. He may have committed any one of hundreds of breaches of the law which Parliament has made offences. He may be of any age from eight to eighty (or even older), and, of course, not necessarily of the male sex.

On the other hand, by no means every wrong that one of us can do another, less still every degradation, untrustworthy conduct, unfitness to be employed or social outrage, is a crime. It is only so if the law has pronounced it to be so. The law is made by Parliament; and the moral code by which Parliament is swayed is the prevailing moral code of the electorate.

Therefore, it is almost true to say that you can judge the moral standards of a people by their criminal law; as much indeed by what they leave out as by what they put in; almost true, but not quite, for the matter is not really as simple as that. It is obviously not always moral indignation which causes certain acts to be made offences. Killing, robbing, and personal cheating are examples of acts which reflect a want of elementary moral sense. But it requires a sense of social morality keyed to a higher pitch to see why it is criminally wrong to cross a clear road against the traffic lights or to buy oneself a watch abroad and bring it home undeclared or to serve a customer after lunch on early closing day. It requires a sense of the fact that the demands of public order come ahead of the freedom of the individual even innocently to express himself as he chooses. Morality at that level restricts at the same time as it protects our personal freedom to do things which in themselves are quite harmless.

On the other hand, lying and bullying, adultery and hard bargaining, avarice and gluttony, morally reprehensible as most people will admit them to be, are not prohibited by the law. There may be several reasons for this. Probably the strongest is that no means have yet been devised of checking such offences by the force of law. Perhaps no legislators have ever been so unconscientious (or indeed impolitic) as to imperil themselves by outlawing

such common faults. Or it may be that the sanctions of public opinion are regarded, in such matters, as having greater force than the machinery of the law. In some cases, indeed, it is a matter of degree. When lying becomes perjury, when bullying amounts to bodily harm or cruelty to children, when marital infidelity is accompanied by sexual perversion, when hard bargaining is based on false pretences, when the miser keeps his secret from the tax collector, and the glutton resorts to the black market, the law does step in to keep the objectionable conduct within bounds; but no more than that.

It comes simply to this, that crimes have generally only one thing in common: they are all acts or omissions which the law has for the time being forbidden. They vary so much in their nature, their gravity and even their permanent effects, that it is misleading and often invidious to classify them under the one comprehensive name of crime. Hence such expressions as 'delinquency', 'anti-social behaviour' and 'maladjustment', which are not really apt substitutes, but have the sole merit of avoiding for the moment the ugly associations of the older and harsher expression. In time they, too, like all mere euphemisms, will acquire the same associations, and will no doubt yield in their turn to some more newly-invented term whose meaning will be extended to cover the same thing. I shall, therefore, keep to the word 'crime' (although technically it is only applied to offences which are triable on indictment) as being as good as any other to cover every form of law-breaking.

What I am concerned to discuss is the relation of crime to our own moral outlook. This outlook we find reflected not only in the laws which it inspires, but also in the way in which we think it right to enforce them. As Christians, both our duty and our ardent inclination should be to hate sin, but love the sinner. When, however, the sinner's offence amounts to a crime, especially one of the more detestable crimes, such is our moral indignation (inflamed, as a rule, by fear) that our hatred of the crime tends to transfer itself to the criminal, greatly to the detriment of whatever love for him lies buried in our consciences. The right to punish there must be. No society could possibly hope to maintain order without that sanction at least in reserve. The problem is to decide what punishment should be inflicted; when recourse to it should be had; and upon whom.

There are, of course, limits to the range of punishments available according to law. These are at the present time deprivation of liberty (and in extreme cases, of life), the infliction of bodily pain, and the imposition of fines. To those could be added

public disgrace and deprivation of civil rights, although nowadays they are consequences following automatically on the sentence in certain classes of case, and are not specifically inflicted (as was disgrace in the days of the stocks and the pillory) as punishments in themselves.

It is, however, most important to take into account, the consequential effects, both deliberate and incidental, of a sentence pronounced by a court; for these may often cause far more suffering than the actual sentence itself. Mercy shown by the judge may again and again be frustrated by the mercilessness of neighbours, workmates and potential employers. So, worse still, may the reforming effect of enlightened treatment in a prison or other institution. Neither the law itself nor those who administer it can grapple alone with the problem of punishment. For better or worse the moral outlook of the public will always assert itself in the end. Potential victims of unpopular judicial severity, like the dangerous drunken motorist arrested by the police before he has done any damage, will often be acquitted by the jury, whereas the wretched club treasurer, who, in a moment of financial desperation, yields to the temptation to dip his hands into the Christmas draw fund, has to face prison and lasting disgrace and ruin rather than risk the fury of his neighbours if he were sent home on probation. The same thing applies to the unbalanced pervert who has once interfered with a young child, even though the experience of prison may be expected to aggravate rather than remedy the cause of his trouble. It is the moral temperature of the public which in many cases determines what the offender is to suffer for his crime.

But is that moral heat generated by hatred of the crime only or also of the criminal? It is certainly not consistent with any love of the criminal. Then from the Christian point of view there must be something very wrong. Where does the fault lie?

Everyone charged with the development and administration of the criminal law, whether Parliament, the Courts or the penal and remedial services, has in recent years moved towards more humane treatment of the offender. A series of statutes tended to change the emphasis in punishment from retribution to reform. The most notable of these was the Criminal Justice Act, 1948, which (amongst other things) almost abolished whipping, as well as imprisonment of those under twenty-one, set up machinery for corrective training of adults, and extended the uses of probation. The policy in the prison service has followed a similar course. The official view is that, so far as possible, it shall be the public disgrace of the sentence coupled with the fact of losing his liberty for a time that is to be regarded by the offender as his punishment.

ment. Once in the institution, he and all concerned with him, are to recognise that he has set out upon the road to rehabilitation. Wherever possible, lock and key are dispensed with, dreary, repetitive, aimless work is gradually being replaced by something more interesting and useful, such as building and gardening, contact with the world outside is cautiously maintained, and interest in worthwhile things is stimulated. Above all, constructive efforts are being made to befriend and guide on their return to their homes, or at any rate to freedom, those who have served their sentences. This applies particularly to the younger offenders and to those who have undergone long terms of imprisonment.

The courts, too, have tended to become much more lenient, especially in their treatment of younger and first offenders. I can still remember when thirty years ago it was normal for a postman convicted of stealing mail to be sentenced to anything from three to seven years' penal servitude; and I shall never forget the shock, at the same period, of witnessing a sixteen-year old boy with a previously clean record, being sent to prison for six months for a single act of gross indecency with another boy of the same age. Anything like the postman's sentence would be unthinkable, and the boy's sentence actually impossible, to-day.

In spite of all this, social conduct shows little sign of improvement. Crime has enormously increased; even if one makes full allowance for the fact that very many cases are brought before the courts in these lenient days which used to be hushed up, ignored or dealt with privately or which used to escape undetected. The model system for prisons is not in satisfactory operation. There is so serious a shortage of accommodation that thousands of prisoners are placed three in a small cell designed to hold just one. Prison staff is undermanned and frequently of the wrong type. Facilities for constructive and interesting work are more often than not unavailable. In such conditions, it is not surprising that many prisoners fail to understand the new approach, abuse their greater freedom, mistake leniency for weakness, and play straight into the hands of the old school of thought in penology who 'told us so'. Even the enlightened system of after-care is still in the experimental stage, and can so far only be written up as a qualified success.

It looks almost as though in our official approach to crime we were loving the criminal too much and hating the crime too little!

Let us then take a look at the probation system, in which above all, an attempt is made to put into practice the Christian ethic referred to. In 1953, the latest year for which figures are so far available, probation officers dealt with just under 30,000 cases.

This figure relates only to offenders. It excludes the many thousands and tens of thousands of domestic cases also dealt with by probation officers at the same time. The theory of probation might fairly be expressed as a process of teaching the criminal through love to join in hating his crime. If properly administered by the Court, the offender is first made to understand that his offence is regarded as detestable, but that he himself is to be given a chance to purge himself of its stain. For a stated period which may be one, two, or three years, he has to be of good behaviour, and under the guidance of the probation officer to live and work as an honest member of the community, not waiting to be helped, but helping himself as far as he can. If he will not make the effort, or his efforts, in spite of the support that he is given, break down, then what may well be a severe sentence awaits him. He may also be ordered, usually out of his future earnings, to make compensation for any loss or damage the victim of his offence may have suffered. With the meaning of the order bluntly explained in court, and with the subsequent attention of a firm but kindly probation officer, it is quite astonishing how many and what people will respond satisfactorily to probation. Not only children and young persons in sore need of guidance and affection will quickly improve; but it has been a demonstrable success in case after case of adults, even those well advanced in years and with serious criminal records. The secret is the practical application of warm-hearted personal interest (if love sounds too sentimental a word to apply to the relationship), coupled with the ruthless setting of a course away from the old, bad way of life.

It is naturally so much easier in the constructive atmosphere of liberty than in the enervating and sometimes frustrating atmosphere of an institution, to convince anyone that his present and future welfare really means something to you. Nevertheless, wonderful results have been produced among the young in Borstal institutions and the better approved schools. Scathing comment is not uncommonly made on the sentimental pampering of our young criminals in approved schools. It sticks in the throats of many of the righteous that at a cost to the taxpayer of £7 and more per head per week little ruffians should be allowed to enjoy advantages that compare favourably with those available to only a few of our well-behaved boys and girls in expensive boarding schools. For the less indignant it is, indeed, a remarkable experience to visit a good approved school (for they vary widely in quality) and to see the clean, bright dormitories, dining hall and common rooms, the shower-baths, the kitchens, class-rooms and workshops. Facilities for laundry and mending are often of the

most modern, and there are usually extensive playing-fields and gardens. Some schools have their own surgery, and even dental surgery. The pupils are provided with neat school clothes, and best clothes for outings. When they leave, they are entirely fitted out with respectable clothes. The staff are all trained for special responsibility and each pupil receives a good deal of individual attention from the time of entry until well after release on licence. Homes are visited; and every effort is made by welfare officers to ensure that they shall be happier places than many of them were before the pupils were removed to an approved school. Where the home is incurably bad, a foster-home is found for the pupil. Employment is also found where the pupil has passed school-leaving age.

Is all this a shocking waste of taxpayers' money? Or is it one of the finest social investments that could possibly be made? In terms alike of human suffering, material loss, and the cost of administration (leaving altogether out of account the moral aspect of the matter), crime is a very expensive burden for a community to carry. If, therefore, our institutions for the young succeed in choking future crime at birth, it is not too extravagant to claim that they can more than pay for themselves. As to whether or not they do succeed, the high percentage of pupils against whom nothing more is ever heard, provides much encouragement. But more eloquent than cold statistics is a visit to an approved school on the occasion of an annual sports day. At one school well known to me, the voluntary attendance each year of 'old boys' actually exceeds the number of pupils currently in the school! Such loyal ties with former pupils of all kinds who have made or are making good are, I believe, common in most of the approved schools. But of all the successes that are scored in these places of correction the most outstanding are frequently amongst those pupils who have scarcely or never known what it is to be loved or wanted by anyone.

What a comment it is on our Christian society that our penal institutions and the homes from which they are supplied are crowded with unloved boys and girls! Want is generally accepted as the most potent cause of crime. But in my experience, being unwanted is far more potent. All the enlightenment in legislation, all the mercy in the courts, all the sympathetic guidance of offenders will do no more than relieve some of the consequences of this root of evil. So long as being unwanted goes unchecked, crime will grow and flourish, and neither harsh nor lenient treatment will check its strangling progress.

How shall we set about dealing with it? To order parents to

love their children is as futile as to command the tide not to flow. To call in science to prevent the birth of unwanted children is equally foredoomed to failure. A small boy, just old enough to read, was walking in a public park with his mother. He saw a notice, 'Birds-nesting strictly forbidden'. 'How silly, Mummy,' he exclaimed. 'As though you could stop them!' But even if it were practicable, would it be ethical to try and exercise such control? Who should determine which children were to be allowed to come into the world? Quite apart from the controversial question whether that is man's prerogative or God's, there is the purely practical aspect of the matter. Some potential parents doubtless know whether they would sooner have a car or a child; and it is probably fortunate for all concerned if their choice is a car. But the great majority (and I must include among them unmarried parents) do not stop to choose. At the critical time they do not think, nor perhaps would they know if they did think, whether a possible child will be loved or not. Still less can any outside person or anyone in authority know what unborn child is going to be wanted when it is there. Nor does it always depend on the circumstances at the time of possible conception. Too often it is the situation which does not arise until after the child has been born which results in its being unwanted.

The typical unloved child which takes to crime, whether in early youth or later on, comes from what is loosely called a broken home. It is the fashion amongst psychologists to-day to deride that expression, pointing out that there are some fifteen varieties of broken home. But I think it is a simple and convenient expression, for all that, to describe a family situation in which the parents have either parted altogether or have openly ceased to live together in harmony. It is at its worst for the child in the not uncommon case of one or both parents having remarried and gathered other family commitments in consequence. One may think, no doubt, of cases where the children of a broken home are happier out of it than they ever were in it. But it is not day to day unhappiness that is the vital mischief. The real evil is the soul-destroying sense of insecurity which comes of not belonging anywhere.

Security is the very foundation of righteousness. It runs as a thread of gold right through the Old Testament. It is the blessing which we derive alike from the sacrifice of the Cross, the reassurance of the Resurrection and the comfort of the Holy Spirit. Without security nothing is permanent. Love has no meaning; for love implies confidence, and where nothing is sure there can be no confidence. As for a moral code, that exists among the insecure only in relation to the urge for hand-to-mouth survival.

I go further, however. Not only can there be no faith without security: as I see it, there can be no security without faith. It is all very well to go witch-hunting for the instigators of our social disorders. The chain of responsibility is circular and, like eternity, ends where it begins and begins where it ends. Blame the offender, and behind him lies the broken home. Blame the selfishness of his parents who broke up the home, and behind them lies the self-sufficiency of the age that sees man's only salvation in escape from his immediate cares. Blame this prevailing point of view, and what lies behind it but our own ineffectiveness? And why are we so ineffective? Because, as we weakly plead, we live in such an imperfect world. Back then we come full circle to our offenders.

To the Christian there can only be one answer. We must not for one moment accept anything lower than Christian standards, first for ourselves and then for anyone else. That is the first part of our duty — the uncompromising hatred of sin. It is so disastrously easy to think that it is fulfilled by visiting our indignation on the offender, whether by punishment or by admonition. To condemn wrong-doing from our place of security is of no more value than to defy the devil with our fingers crossed. We have to strip off our material protection and go down into the fiery furnace with no other safeguard than the company of the angel of the Lord.

This language may sound colourful, but I use it advisedly. To help and befriend the few offenders who may come our way is not to fulfil the whole Christian duty to love the sinner. If we truly love him we must be ready at whatever material cost to ourselves, to remove the cause whereby the offence comes. A few years ago I was in Copenhagen. While there, I asked some Danish friends why it was that the lovely small children whom I saw playing in the streets seemed to grow so quickly into the porridge-faced adolescents one frequently saw sloping along with their heads down. My friends put it down to broken homes. 'Our marriage-laws,' they said, 'make divorce so easy that it is a commonplace to find unhappy children whose parents have parted. Not only so, but even the children from happy homes feel wretched and insecure. They see what has happened in their school-friends' homes, and wonder uneasily if it might not be their turn next.'

We regard it perhaps as inhumane to decline to dissolve a marriage which has broken down. But do we always think where our lovingkindness to the few unfortunate is carrying us? To be indulgent to wrong in the name of loving the wrongdoer is surely no better than hating the criminal because we hate his crime. If the broken home is a menace to civilization, then it is our business,

at any price short of our souls, to keep homes together. If there are social and economic causes which contribute to the breaking-up of homes, then we must work actively to eliminate those causes. If brotherly love has become discredited and self-seeking has taken its place as a rule of life, then it is for us to restore the true standard of value. How individually we should set about doing this I cannot presume to say. I should only care to express the opinion that the personal call comes to each one that is ready for it. Offences will certainly come, and by law we shall have to deal with them. Someone will have to cast the first stone. It may be you or it may be I. Whatever account we feel able to give of ourselves, the task will be an invidious one. When we look at crime we cannot afford to shrug our shoulders and pass by on the other side. When we look at the criminal, we dare not, however pityingly, thank God that we are not as other men. Even to praise the grace of God that it is not ourselves is not enough. That stone has to be cast, and it has fallen to us to cast it. The most and also the least that we as Christians can do towards fitting ourselves for that duty, is with all the strength that is in us at once to hate crime and to love the criminal.

CHRISTIANS AND THE RACE QUESTION

By the Rev. John Drewett, M.A., B.Sc., Rector of St. Margaret's, Lothbury

THE question of race relationships, as a problem to be solved, is comparatively recent. Antiquity seems to have known no difficulty about race as such, and the early Church looked upon all men as equal in the sight of God, and if it had any basis for dividing men into superior and inferior breeds, it was not on the ground of race, but of religion. The great divide was between Christians and others.

The race problem has arisen as a result of the admixture of races which has followed from the spread of European civilization and the migration of the white peoples to those countries where the inhabitants were of a different colour. Even so, the attitude of different European nations to the coloured peoples was not always the same, nor, in fact, has the treatment of coloured peoples by the whites of any one European country been the same in all places at all times. There are many factors involved in race relationships; the subject is a most complicated one.

Our starting point must be the historical facts which have brought us to the present position. In recent centuries, there have been two major waves of white expansion. The first was in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when Portuguese and Spanish explorers discovered the Americas, the Far East and the coasts of Africa south of the equator. The results of their contacts with peoples of other races can still be seen in the descendants of those early settlers. In general, it may be said that the followers of the Roman obedience have sought to bring people, of whatever colour, into the Church, and although some of them were guilty of the most appalling cruelty in their suppression of native peoples, they did not despise them on racial so much as on cultural grounds. Papal pronouncements of those days were emphatic in their insistance that American Indians and Negroes were human beings, members of the family of God, and that they had rights in virtue of their humanity which had to be respected. Above all, it was the duty of their Christian conquerors to civilize them and to bring them to baptism. This having been done, they were accepted as members of the Christian community. The Roman Church has always allowed racially mixed marriages, and has fought every attempt of governments to prevent such unions. It may be said, in general, that the relationship of the Latin nations to coloured peoples is regulated by a culture bar rather than by a colour bar. That is, it is not something which is based on race or colour, and is

therefore unchangeable, fixed for all time. It is possible for the man of colour, when he crosses the culture bar by education and baptism, to be completely accepted into white society.

The second wave of white expansion was that of the Northern and Protestant European powers in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. In point of time, the slave trade is the beginning of the contact of Europe with Africa south of the equator and is the commencement of a new and terrible chapter in race relationships. The origin of the trade was the demand for labour in the newly developing plantations of the West Indies and Southern States of America. In other words, it was primarily economic. Many writers who are in no sense Marxist, attribute the rise of the race problem to the spread of capitalism and colonialism, and find its basis mainly in the demand for cheap and plentiful supplies of labour for work which white men were unable to do.

The trade was justified on the grounds that negroes were subhuman and could be bought and sold as animals, and even Christians were prepared to tolerate it provided that they did not know too much of what was going on.

It has been said in mitigation of these horrors and of the acquiescence in them of the majority of western Christians, that the treatment meted out to the poorer classes at home was cruel and barbarous by our modern standards. In other words, the cruelty shown to the African was not entirely a matter of race. Black men, it is true, were thought of as inferior to white, but some white men treated others almost as badly as they treated the Africans. John Newton as a boy received a hundred lashes with the cat for attempting to run away from the navy. Then again, the trade was made much worse by the fact that the sea passage, in the ships available in those days, was a frightful experience — but it was almost as bad for the white crews as it was for the slaves. In other words, those were crude and hard times when life was cheap; it was the kind of moral climate in which slavery could be readily accepted.

But when all has been said, the slave trade remains a frightful blot upon the record of the so-called Christian nations; and it has embittered race relationships for the past three centuries and has left its legacy of doubt in the minds of too many Europeans as to the spiritual and mental equality of the African with themselves, no matter how Christian or cultured he may become. There are many Africans, too, who doubt the validity of a religion which was able to make so little impression upon its adherents even after a thousand years or more.

Africa apart, the worst treatment meted out to the coloured

peoples was in the South Sea Islands, and here again a flourishing slave trade went on for many years. We are familiar enough with the complete exterminaion of the Tasmanian natives, who were hunted like rats; and it was only the vastness of the Australian continent which prevented the same fate from overcoming the Australian aborigines. The one exception to this story of attempted mass extermination of whole peoples in the South Seas was in the case of New Zealand. Here white settlement came comparatively late, after the white man had become more civilized in his attitude to native peoples. In New Zealand the missionaries actually preceded the settlers and, although war broke out between settlers and Maoris, the latter were allowed to remain in certain parts of the country and gradually a united nation, in which the Maoris have full political rights, has been formed.

In their contacts with Asia, the white races have adopted a rather different attitude. It is true that they have considered themselves superior to Asians, but even Europeans could not deny that these countries had behind them centuries of civilization of which they were justly proud. In the case of India and China, the ruling classes were fabulously wealthy, and it was in the interests of trade to respect them. It was for this reason that European governments were always careful to keep a certain neutrality in matters of religion, and to respect the culture of those with whom they wished to conduct business. Nevertheless, there have not been lacking episodes, such as the opium wars in China, or more recently the dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan, which show that the white man is prepared to do things in Asia which he would hesitate to do to those of his own race.

For hitherto, no matter how cultured Indians or Chinese may have been, they have been powerless against the superior military and economic strength of the West, which has resulted from the scientific and technical revolution. In a very real sense, the rest of the world has been subject to white domination, whether it be of the ruthless colonial type or of the more veiled economic type; and the powerful always consider themselves to be superior to those over whom they wield power. As long as this preponderance of Western power and prestige remained undisturbed, there was no race ' problem ' ; the inequality of the races and the superiority of the white race was taken for granted. This did not mean, of course, that the subject races were content that it should be so, or that they believed it to be true. On the contrary; they were awaiting the day when the balance of power would be restored in their favour, and this day is now rapidly approaching. It is its inevitable

approach which creates the race problem of our time which, if not solved, will lead to the greatest of all the world wars, the West against the rest.

Several factors have played their part in bringing about the present situation. First and most important has been the spread of the Gospel and of modern scientific knowledge. The Church has been responsible for sending to Africa and the East doctors, teachers, craftsmen, as well as clergy and lay evangelists. It has taught the peoples of other countries to read and write and has often been responsible for transmitting their language to writing for the first time. All this has given them a new purpose and significance as persons, and has awakened in them a desire to change their whole way of life. It is not easy for us to appreciate the tremendous force with which the Christian gospel comes to the non-Christian who takes it seriously. It is indeed the most powerful force known to men, and its dynamic is not weakened by the fact that the white man himself does not take it seriously. Hitherto, the Asians and Africans have accepted life fatalistically as nasty, brutish and short, and their religions have enabled them to make the best of what they believed to be unalterable. For century after century they have lived by the principle that what cannot be cured must be endured. The missionary, and more recently the agents of the United Nations and other similar bodies, have now convinced millions of Asians and Africans that these age-long scourges of disease and poverty are no longer the inevitable lot of mankind, and they are now determined to be rid of them and to follow the example of the West in making life on this planet as comfortable as the new knowledge makes possible.

This widespread determination of the under-privileged peoples of the world to improve their living standards is what we call the great awakening of our times. It has a direct bearing upon the colour problem because it is, in effect, a demand to be equal in every way with the white races. This insistence upon a reasonable share in the things of this life, together with a spiritual demand for equality with those who have hitherto ruled over them, is bound to be resisted by a white minority, who feel themselves threatened by the rising tide of the non-white peoples. A further factor which has helped to destroy white supremacy and has lessened the white man's confidence in himself is, of course, the devastating effect of two civil wars within Western civilization, which have weakened the West in every way, spiritually, morally and physically, as over against the East. The fact that Western civilization is in such a state of disintegration, cannot but give added confidence to the non-Western world.

It is this new self-confidence of the coloured races, together with the lack of unity and purpose in the West, which is the root of the present colour problem. The white race, faced with a threat to its supremacy, is attempting to find some scientific, religious or moral ground for maintaining its pride of place amongst the races of the world. Colour bar is the outward expression of this determination and, as might be expected, it is taken to its most extreme limits in those countries such as South Africa, Kenya and the Southern States of the U.S.A., where the different races live in close proximity and where each is determined to stay permanently. In those countries, where one of the races numerically far outnumbers the others, such as Nigeria or the Gold Coast in Africa, or India and China in Asia, there is little racial feeling in comparison, unless, of course, such a country feels itself under threat of attack from a Western power.

We turn now to the methods by which the white race is attempting to assert its supremacy in the face of the uprising of the rest of the world. In recent decades, from about the '80's of the last century, various racial theories have been propounded which have postulated some scientific basis for the racial superiority of the whites. The Germans, in particular, have published masses of material claiming to demonstrate that there are biological and anthropological proofs for the superiority of the white man over all others. More recent elaborations of these theses sought to prove that within the white race itself there was a hierarchy, and that at the top was Nordic Man, of which the German was the most perfect manifestation. As a matter of fact, the patent absurdity of much of this nonsense exposed the whole attempt to find a scientific basis for racial superiority, and no reputable scientist of whatever nationality would now substantiate any theory of permanent and ineradicable gradations of physical or mental endowments on grounds of race alone. There are individuals of all races who are capable of the highest mental or physical development; there are many who fall far below the average. Race, as such, is irrelevant in such a classification.

The ground for racial superiority has now shifted from a scientific to a moral basis. Many white people now accept the scientific evidence for racial equality, but still believe that they are the trustees of a superior civilization which it is their duty to defend at almost any cost. This is the position of such a man as the South African scholar, Dr. B. J. Marais, in his very important book, *Colour: Unsolved Problem of the West* (Cape Town : Howard B. Timmins, 1952). Dr. Marais will accept no scientific or theological

grounds for racial superiority, but maintains that, in fact, the white race must defend itself if it is, in the long run, to do its duty to the Africans.

Now, no one would deny that the white man has something to give to the rest of the world and, in fact, the rest of the world is accepting it as fast as it can. The dilemma of the whites is that the quicker and more effectively they pass on their knowledge and accept their responsibility to the under-privileged races, the sooner will come the time when their contribution will have been made and they will be asked to accept equality with other races. The West cannot even expect gratitude for the good it has done, because its contribution has been too ambiguous and its motives too questionable.

It is the pride and arrogance of the West which suggests that the West has given all and has received nothing in return. The contacts made by the races have effected them all. There is, for example, an increasing number of Westerners who are becoming disillusioned with the fruits of Western culture and who believe that the East has a great deal to teach us about spiritual and aesthetic values. It is arrant nonsense for us to think that we have all the goods and that we have nothing to receive from other races and cultures.

The contribution which the West has to give to the rest of the world will no longer be acceptable if it is given in the spirit of patronage which is implied in such phrases as the White Man's Burden. Patronage is as offensive to the coloured peoples now as was the blatant imperialism of a former age. Nothing will now stand a chance of acceptance but an approach of genuine friendship and equality, based upon a fundamental belief in the human family as an infinitely varied community with a common purpose and a common home. This approach, if realistic and not sentimental, will still accept the responsibility which the more advanced nations have for the under-privileged peoples of the world, but it will aim at so developing their potentialities that an equality of opportunity and status, which now exists only in principle, will be realized in practice. Unless, however, the principle is fully accepted, the practice will never be carried out.

We can always discover whether the right principle is determining the practice in any particular case, be it in education, agricultural development, medicine or industrial enterprise. If the whites are doing something for the non-whites, the principle is wrong; if they are working with them, training them to take their place, they are working according to right principles. Patronage consists in doing good to others and in maintaining a supply of

'others' to whom good can be done! The only acceptable approach to-day is to do things with the others in such a way that they will soon be able to do them for themselves. But such an attitude depends upon a conviction that they are in no wise inferior to their instructors.

We might sum up this part of our discussion by saying that the colour problem rests now, not upon any rational or even moral basis, but upon fear, prejudice, pride and other emotional maladjustments. It is precisely for this reason that the attack upon it must come from religion. The scientists have told us what we ought to believe about the colour question; only a dynamic faith can bring us to accept the facts and to alter our behaviour to accord with them. It is a question now of knowing what we ought to do, but of not having the power to do it.

We should perhaps point out at once, that in the matter of colour, Christians are not as enlightened as are Moslems or, for that matter, Communists. This is probably due to the fact that the expansion of Christianity into Europe was far more rapid than it was into Asia, with the consequence that it is looked upon, in the main, as a white man's religion. It has, too, been so closely linked with European civilization that the East has found it difficult to think of it as a world religion and has, on the whole, regarded it as a disrupting force. Too often, Christianity has been presented in such a way as to suggest the inferiority of all other religions and cultures, and this attitude of spiritual pride on the part of some Christians has set up barriers between the races rather than removing them. The Church, therefore, has a great deal of leeway to make up. In recent ecumenical conferences, the principle that in Christ there is no East or West has been emphatically stated, and no sane Christian can be in any doubt as to what his attitude to people of other colour than himself should be. The question now, as in other matters such as war, is one of obedience. Until Christians are prepared to act, at whatever cost to themselves, in defiance of generally accepted modes of behaviour, the gulf between principle and practice will remain wide open and the Church will fail to commend the gospel of power which it offers to the non-Christian world.

What then must the Church do in this very critical situation? There are two fields of action which must be considered: there is the witness of the Church in countries where the whites are in a minority and there is its witness in European countries where there are minorities of coloured people.

The Church's survival in African and Asian countries depends upon its ability to live down the idea that it is a foreign body

imposed upon the country by Western imperialist powers. The relation between Church and Government has often been too close for the ultimate good of the Church. It would be quite tragic if an African country, on gaining political independence, were to turn against Christianity on the ground that it was part of an order which had disappeared. However, in British territories, the Church is to some extent aware of this danger and has, for some considerable time, been preparing the Africans to take charge of their own Church. Nothing does more to undermine the colour bar than the promotion of Africans to the hierarchy of the Churches. After all, it is difficult for the colour-ridden European to maintain that Africans are incapable of doing anything other than unskilled labour, when they are successfully carrying out the duties of a Bishop or Superintendent Minister in the Church!

In areas such as Kenya, where there is a racially mixed community, the Church must demonstrate in its own life that Christianity is a supra-racial faith and that the Church is a supra-racial fellowship. In this it has not been conspicuously successful. European Christians in colonial territories often find it extremely difficult to worship with native peoples or to invite them into their homes. Nevertheless, considerable progress is being made, and things are now accepted which would have been unthinkable even twenty years ago. The present upheaval in Kenya has brought increasing numbers of Europeans to see that if they are to remain in the country, it must be as members of a truly inter-racial society. The worst of all mistakes in colonial government is to give the subject peoples education even to university standard, and then to give them no opportunity to use their skill and training and to treat them as inferior beings on the ground of their colour. Embittered and frustrated intellectuals are the most potent source of trouble in any society. In the creation of new social customs and of a new attitude on the part of the whites to the Africans, the Churches have a vital part to play.

In this country, too, there is a most important contribution to be made by the Churches. It is their primary function to lead men in the worship of a God who is Lord of the whole earth and to preach the Gospel of human brotherhood so that men are faced with their responsibilities as members of a world community. Church membership which fails to awake in the individual a sense of belonging to a world-wide fellowship of all races is not adequate in this mid-twentieth century. There never was a time when the overseas work of the Church was in greater need of understanding by Western Christians than now.

Then, finally, there is the stranger in our midst. Not only are

there thousands of non-European students in colleges and universities who will return as leaders of thought and affairs in their own countries, but there is an ever-increasing number of coloured workers who have been attracted to this country by the chance of employment and a higher standard of living. There are here all the makings of a colour problem unless certain steps are quickly taken.

Each of these people lives in someone's parish, and it is to the Church that they should be able to look for help and fellowship. More particularly, the Christian community should expose attempts to exploit coloured folk by unscrupulous landlords, and should denounce colour prejudice when they find it. Already there are signs of discrimination in obtaining employment, and it is clear that the attitude of British people at home is no different from that of any other northern European when their livelihood appears to be threatened.

It is indeed a difficult exercise in personal relationships to break down the colour bar even in the atmosphere of the Christian Church. The only solution is that we should get to know Africans or Asians as friends and be on such terms with them that frank speaking on both sides is possible and the fact of colour difference is forgotten. One thing we shall discover is, that underneath the colour of the black or brown skin there are all the differences which exist underneath white skins. There are honest Africans and dishonest ones, friendly ones and temperamental ones, extreme nationalists and others with an internationalist outlook. There are Africans who are over-sensitive to the question of colour and there are those who treat the white man as one of themselves. It is as fatal to generalize about Africans or Asians as it is about Europeans. We shall get nowhere unless we are prepared to think of them and accept them as persons with those infinite varieties of endowment which make personal relationships so difficult but so fascinating and rewarding.

THE CHURCH AND THE WELFARE STATE

By the Rev. Canon M. T. Dunlop, M.A., Director of Religious Education, Diocese of Manchester

IT is well to begin the consideration of any aspect of human affairs by recognizing the element of necessity. All populous industrial societies must evolve some form of Welfare State, at least in the sense of creating centralized and co-ordinated social services and a planned economy. They must do so to control disease; to possess a sufficiency of administrators, technicians and literate workpeople; and to harmonize individual enterprises so that at any rate the whole economy is viable. From this angle, the *raison d'être* of the town-bred Russian revolution was to make a Welfare State, as that of its present tyranny is to maintain it. The essence of the political struggle in the United States is the compulsion upon the Federal Government to extend its welfare activities — be it a Federal police, support of farm-prices, or New Deal legislation — against the stubborn resistance of the forty-eight states, jealous of their rights, and the militant individualism of the citizen that is a relic of the days of Westward expansion. The decision of the Supreme Court that negroes shall not be segregated within the educational systems of the states is the latest hammer-blow. France will not recover herself until she concedes on the necessity for a more widely planned economy and forces her rich to accept it. As a Church, therefore, in our relations with the Welfare State, our starting-point must be one of acceptance, an attitude natural enough for Christians whose religion is incarnationalist and realist and who were exhorted to let the dead bury their dead.

> We cannot revive old factions,
> We cannot restore old policies,
> Or follow an antique drum.

When we come to the particular form that a Welfare State should assume, we pass beyond necessity into the realm of political choice. The British form has been Christian in its origins and principles; it was created not only of necessity, but of will. Its origins lie in those small groups of Christian people who formed voluntary societies in the first half of the nineteenth century to ameliorate the disastrous effects of the industrial revolution upon the bulk of the people. From these societies have grown all the great social departments of our contemporary state. It is this that has accounted for the Christian outlook of our Civil Servants and for their relations of trust and friendship with other citizens working

in the same fields, an outcome that we owe to the benign influence of the Elizabethan Settlement under which to be active as a Christian is to be active as a citizen and men may equally serve both Church and State. The two cardinal principles of our Welfare State are contained in the Beveridge Report. First, 'no man shall have cake until all have bread'. Second, the method of financing services of relief is primarily insurance, deliberately chosen as preserving that ideal of individual contributions within a system of mutual help which stemmed from the Friendly Societies.

This factor of political choice as to the form of the Welfare State is to-day very generally forgotten. Many think of it as an organism that has evolved inexorably and runs itself on red-tape, carrying them as helpless passengers. The sheer size of the Welfare State makes for this impression. Church people tend to view it under its eleemosynary and medical aspects, but these form only a fraction of the whole. Again, in contrast to the early voluntary services, those of the State are chiefly concerned with preventive measures of a radical, comprehensive and continuous sort. The development has been from small grants for Church Schools to a universal statutory system of education; or from drains to land-planning for the whole country. Social service has become a major activity of the nation, comparable to its industry or agriculture. Last year it cost well over 1,800 million pounds, being a rise of nearly 300 millions on the previous year, as against just over 1,600 millions spent on defence. Simultaneously, the contribution of the Socialist Party has been to emphasize the attack on poverty at the source through full employment at good wages, entailing manifold controls of credit and material resources. In the result, the maintenance of social welfare involves ever deeper invasion by the State of almost every branch of life. What as a pragmatic people we are loath to recognize is that a State become thus universal and creative must in fact create something and in accordance with some idea. It were an illusion to imagine that the Welfare State merely multiplies houses and hospitals, bread and circuses, or that we have said anything of significance when we condemn it as materialist. It is true that the financial measures necessary to our form of Welfare State have radically changed the structure of our society in an egalitarian direction. But we are too near the history of the matter to overlook the crucial fact that it was political ideas that necessitated those measures and made them feasible. Belief in equality is reflected in draconian direct taxation and Death Duties; the notion of mutual security in both social insurance and indirect taxation; the idea of a direct attack on poverty informs the Keynesian Treasury controls, the

coming of Family Allowances and legislation like the Catering Act. We are witnessing the operation of a distributive justice and, as Aristotle showed us, the form of that justice is determined by the character of the polity. In general, the Welfare State has been created in the strength of beliefs that came to possess the minds and hearts of the ruling classes in the course of the nineteenth century. These beliefs have worked, not only an astonishing betterment in the health and happiness of the masses, but also the profoundest political and economic revolution in history.

We must bear in mind the profundity of this revolution if we share the present acute anxieties, felt by men of all parties, about the Welfare State. The grounds for anxiety are not to be sought primarily in the machinery of the Welfare State as such, but in the political, or spiritual condition of the whole society. The original Christian inspiration of welfare faltered with the failure of the Church of England in the mid-nineteenth century, and its by-product, the humanitarianism of the Fabians, which moved so many social reformers at the beginning of this century, being doctrinally rootless, has now dried up. Moreover, these formative political ideas never possessed the working-classes to any depth, and they are now enfranchised. What shall be the determining idea of our society in future? That same question haunts Sweden, which has achieved the completest welfare services in the world. We have reached an era of political hesitancy served by administrators moved by the dying momentum of past beliefs. In this circumstance the vast machine of social welfare does indeed carry us as passengers; and to what destination? History owes us no debt. Social services become all-pervasive and lacking a defined purpose, serving a multitude having no sense of responsibility towards them, must increasingly threaten the Christian concept of life. The form of Welfare State rooted in that concept is already threatened. Already its financial measures are tending to defeat their object: high taxation and full employment, by weakening material incentives, are threatening the wealth which the Welfare State would fairly distribute. The Health Services now cost three times the original estimate, whilst the Government Actuary calculates that the deficiency on the Pensions Account alone will be running at 417 million pounds per annum in 1977. On the last analysis these are moral matters, the only cure for inflation being an increase of output for the same wage or profit, a view so unpopular as to seem absurd. In administration, there are questions of responsibility and of the optimum size of a unit of which we are only becoming aware; and significantly they are at their most acute in the educational field, which indicates that we are at a loss

not as to techniques, but as to purpose. Rather than criticizing the Welfare State, the business of the Church is to save it from bankruptcy and futility. In the ultimate is politics, that is, the wills of men. As Christians, we are not caged helpless in an immutable materialist society; of all men we have the power to sustain and to change it, for we have proven access to men's beliefs and wills.

From the Christian standpoint, which in this regard is that of European civilization, the danger of the Welfare State is its threat to freedom. This danger is inherent in the administrative methods of such a State, but its root lies at a deeper level. The radical and perennial question for any group of men is that of authority. In the Welfare State an old authority that had served its turn is flaking away with the stately homes that housed it, while the new has not yet taken shape because we are not yet decided on what idea of society shall inform it.

From the Reformation for over three centuries England was an oligarchy, broadly based on the remains of a more ancient feudal order, and informed by a Christian idea of society. This oligarchy had two features of significance for us. It recognized the aristocratic principle, and if it usually confused aristocracy with the possession of wealth, it never identified the two. In any case, the political value of a wealthy aristocracy is in its disinterestedness. Its social value is in its individualism and eccentricity. Secondly, this English oligarchy was based on consent. The oligarchs gave deliberate and critical consent to government of their own making, and the masses consented to the government of the oligarchs, albeit tacitly. They consented partly by virtue of the feudal sub-structure of society wherein each man was able to recognize a few immediate superiors close by him; they consented also by virtue of that Christian idea of society under which ruler and ruled had alike their duties of service. The Social Contract was the Catechism which applied equally to all men in whatever station of life it had pleased God to call them. This oligarchy had many ugly aspects, and latterly was held together by a penal code of oriental savagery. Yet it survived the loss of an empire, overwhelmed two continental tyrants, and bequeathed to Europe those ideals of religious tolerance, representative government and the equality of women that spelt its own doom. It gave birth to the liberal tradition, though it died of the pangs.

There has followed a period of transition in the nature of authority that is now ending. It has been marked by the arrival of universal suffrage and education, the one mechanical, the other rudimentary. It has been marked also by the wilting away of the

Christian idea of society. We have tided ourselves over this period by what Bagehot called 'deferential government', the ghost of oligarchic power that only recently has been laid, though it still takes its gaitered walk in the cloisters of the Church. So powerful were the ideas of the liberal tradition that in their strength the *epigoni* of the oligarchs have overthrown two more continental tyrants, but by such an expenditure of able men and of wealth, and with such an increase and concentration in the power of the State, that the liberal tradition is near exhaustion. To-day our polity is an unstable hybrid, an autocratic-democracy, and the radical question confronting us is into what more permanent form it shall develop. The essence of the threat latent in the Welfare State, greatly enhanced by the possibility of an atomic war whose ossifying ray already strikes the very universities, is that, by its institutions and methods, it is pressing us continually towards the solution of despotism. The style of the despotism would be collectivist, to answer the physical needs of an advanced and populous industrial society whose technical achievements make possible the administrative machinery of collectivism. At the same time the Welfare State, by its procedures, is withering away the spiritual forces of the individual man that alone might master it and set it in a different direction.

Already the new rulers are emerging on both sides of industry, in commerce and the Civil Service. Already the links are being forged of the new chain of authority; mass education and entertainment, the *mystique* of good citizenship, administrative uniformity and the bribery of bigger wages and benefits. Already Parliament is very much an instrument for promulgating and legalizing the acts of rulers not dependent upon it. We are so far saved politically but threatened economically by the fact that the new rulers are in two hostile camps and spend much of their energies undoing each other's actions. Meantime, the democracy, at its present elementary stage, has but one single power, that of inertia; yet, being semi-skilled in the Three Rs, and having largely lost the inarticulate wisdom of its feudal forefathers, it can be brought adequately to use the ballot-boxes. Already the aristocratic principle has almost vanished, that is, rule in the light of absolute values equally striven after by ruler and ruled. Already to a corresponding and dangerous degree government by consent has evaporated.

The collapse of consent is to be seen in our attitude to work, which is no longer done well because a simple duty, nor gladly because a contribution made to society that in turn sustains the worker. This is true of all classes. Too many young clergy will

not go North: too many Day School teachers will do nothing after four o'clock; too many shop-keepers and business men have no care but for profit; too many industrial concerns will not plough back profit unless Income Tax be so adjusted that profits remain the same. Or it may be seen in our thirst to take all we can out of the Welfare State, whether by abuse of the Health Service or by inflation of directors' expenses. *C'est la banque qui paye.* The widespread apathy towards politics and international affairs is alarming, especially amongst younger people. A 30 per cent. Local Government poll is not unusual, while voluntary societies bemoan the lack of volunteers and the weakness in sense of vocation. The fires that burned in Victorian bellies are gone out. The astounding sums spent on the Pools reflect an emotional rejection of the social and economic order. In short, the new State in which we should be members of one another is hardly recognized and little understood. Its claims are overlooked or ignored and its authority is beginning to be one imposed, rather than one which we collectively create by continuous, informed, and critical consent to its exercise as the expression of an idea of society which we know and value.

Once set in its present direction, then doubtless the developments of the Welfare State have acquired their own almost irresistible momentum, but the direction was largely determined by the basic predisposition of those who created it. Had the Church been stronger in the mid-nineteenth century, empowering men to judge themselves and master their circumstances, the developments might well have been very different. As it is, we can but reflect on the irony of life by which the virtues of one generation come to a weedy harvest in the next.

The rescue of the country from the Hogarthian consequences of the industrial revolution was undertaken by a few Christian men and women of the upper classes who were moved by pity. The nature of their motive has been the most important single factor in the development of the Welfare State as we have it. Pity as a principal Christian feeling was the invention of the nineteenth century. Yet pity should only be occasional in a Christian community, since it is aroused only when we have the advantage. There cannot be pity as between equals, and as a prevalent mood it is a corruption of charity, which mighty word acquired a sorry meaning in the last century. Yet in a society wrecked by the industrial revolution and fallen far from the Christian state, pity had to serve and performed mighty works, though its Dead Sea fruit is with us now.

So long as most social workers were convinced Christians, pity

being disciplined by grace had its proper and limited function, but as Christianity waned, for the increasing band of social workers and reformers, pity expanded into a derived humanitarianism. The necessity to deal scientifically with large numbers intensified the moral process. From the beginning, most social service had to take the form of trained workers backed by numerous subscribers dealing with people in their thousands, rather than of one person helping another. It became 'case-work', the applicants being recorded and filed by each charitable society, and soon in London and Manchester the various societies using a common register. Such methods were a necessity, but combined with the waning of Christian conviction, have had lamentable effects. Humanitarianism became diluted into a generalized benevolence concerned always with groups or percentages of the people, with classes and movements, and seldom with this man or that woman. As the national standards of life improved, social workers took as their primary aim, pursued with astonishing self-sacrifice, the searching out and rehabilitation of those groups in which the incidence of ill-luck, poverty and disease was high and, very often, that of mental ability low. The voluntary and statutory bodies alike, in the kinds of help offered, in their outlook, structure, and methods were designed to this humane end. The underlying ideal was noble. The laudable intention of social workers was to break down the segregation of their clients and to bring them into line with the rest of the nation. The Minority Report on the Poor Law of 1907, which envisaged its breaking up, became their Bible for forty years. They have succeeded beyond all expectation, but in the event, by virtue of their social philosophy, it is the rest of the nation that has been brought into line with their clients. The same voluntary and statutory bodies that cared for the submerged groups have been expanded into the departments of the Welfare State, with much the same characteristics and outlook, and administered by the same social workers, or their pupils, with new titles. Yet the case-worker and Relieving Officer of fifty years ago must turn in their graves to learn that the better-paid artisan, who in his self-respect still upholds the fabric of our world, sends his children freely to school where their dinners are heavily subsidized, their milk gratis and their plimsolls provided; that secondary and university education calls for no parental sacrifice except from the upper and professional classes; or that free medicines for rich and poor may yet be a main plank in an election platform. The Speenhamland Act was confined to the Home Counties; the new Welfare Acts bid fair to debauch the whole nation. The universalizing of benevolence has of course entailed

the disappearance of the benevolent. There remains, now operating automatically, the administrative machinery of benevolence applied to the whole population by 670,000 Civil Servants and a million Local Government Officers. Their elected masters have little power, and for many of these to occupy a position where one can appear as benevolent has become a political ambition instead of a Christian or humanitarian urge. Most seriously, the foundation of government by consent has been washed away with the erosion of the independence of the individual to consent or to refuse.

Generalized benevolence has had serious consequences for industry. A social philosophy apart, the coming of vast industrial and distributive units, and of much repetitive work, has tended to depersonalize both workers and managers, but the disparity in well-being between one kind of industry and another, or even between similar concerns, indicates that the imponderable factors of attitude and outlook are determinative. Benevolence has been at least as responsible as the strike weapon for the very necessary improvements in pay and conditions. Obversely, the ruling groups, although widely recruited, have lost faith in themselves and for two generations have sheered away from the exercise of authority, at home or abroad, as unChristian and reactionary. The workers have been for so long at the receiving end of benevolence and condescension that a dangerous number of them has come to regard ever better pay and easier conditions as a self-evident right. Self-pity is an occupational disease of the miners and dockers, and is now infecting the railwaymen. Few of them stop to ask whether in a planned economy with full employment the function of a Trade Union has not changed, so that like a mediaeval guild it should be as concerned with standards and efficiency as with pay and conditions; fewer still to wonder whether the conceding of their annual January demands is not bringing down the whole economy about their ears. Many Trades Union leaders are publicly asking such questions, and the country is indebted to that moral courage which they have acquired from Nonconformist homes. But the immediate result has been to alienate the leaders from the rank and file and to exalt the shop-stewards and the unofficial strike. The methods of the unofficial strikers against any man independent enough to be loyal to his Union constitute a factory tyranny as ruthless as any in Wellington's England. Doubtless there are contributory reasons — the great size of the Unions, high profits and the flaunting of wealth, and the number of employers still unconverted to the doctrine of co-operation for the common good. Yet the imminent danger is that this daring experiment of the

Welfare State will fail at its industrial heart and that society, merely to get its bread, will condone the return of masters that can drive with unemployment as their goad. The fundamental reason for our condition is political and spiritual. Benevolence has engendered self-pity: work is done either as a grudging favour or as a minimum stint of chores performed by children in a household for whose maintenance and government they have no responsibility.

So soon as the benevolent complete their task and destroy themselves, until the despot takes over, the Welfare State must be managed by administrators of a nationalized benevolence nourished on a legacy of dead formulae. The peculiar, the personal, the traditional, in any case lacking theoretical justification, become administrative nuisances. The trend is towards levelling down the differences of individuality and wearing away troublesome independence. The Church Aided Schools, for example, have for five years been engaged in a mounting struggle against the erosion of their rights, chiefly by some Education Authorities. What is at stake is their position, with the Direct Grant schools, as the only independent bodies within the statutory system of education. By a mere administrative act, the Direct Grant list was virtually closed in 1946. For spiritual equality with variety there is substituted a quantitative egalitarianism with sameness. As André Gide remarked, there are those who, if they dared to speak frankly of the Shepherd who left the ninety and nine to seek the one gone astray, would declare His conduct to be abominably unjust. Since there are lacking the religious element of self-judgment and the Christian detachment which comes of being in the world but not of it, there is a failure of discrimination. Because in the good society all should have bread before any have cake, it does not follow that all should have a secondary education according to the aptitude of all before any have Greek. Yet that became an exalted error. Where the guiding concept is impersonal and quantitative, government becomes identical with an administration that is total and all pervasive whose business is to run the daily lives of a population no longer to be trusted to run themselves.

Given the hiatus in the development of authority from the oligarchic to the democratic forms, and there are some eager to fill the gap. For the first time in our history we now see the rise of the demagogue. In other quarters the machinery of Trades Unionism, the proceeding by delegation and card-votes, designed for the sudden stresses of the industrial war, is used in the attempt to shape high domestic and foreign policy. This year the Congress

of Co-operatives, in speaking for eleven million people, decided by a card-vote majority of six to five millions for the unilateral banning of the hydrogen bomb and against rearming Germany, yet it may be doubted if as many as eleven thousand of Co-operative shoppers had ever seriously weighed these matters or were even aware of what was done in their name. The Trades Unions and the Co-operatives largely finance Her Majesty's Opposition and the Co-operatives have sixteen Members of Parliament. This is to undermine Parliamentary government and to substitute for it a mode of authority in which the consent of the governed is only a pretence. The enfranchisement of women has for the time being worsened matters, for they are immediately concerned with the needs of child and home, easily seduced by social bribery, and as yet untrained to perceive the importance of the abstractions of politics.

The makers of our Welfare State, by the giving of their fortunes and lives, have secured everything for the masses except freedom. From the fount of pity have flowed rights but not duties, claims but not obligations, benefits without sacrifice. In the last resort, the benevolent could not bring themselves to grant the final emancipation of service. The welfare has been taken, the State ignored, because the idea of the State with its high responsibilities has not been shared. The multitudes of our half-born democracy, that may yet prove to have been still-born, are hardly aware that a new State has arrived and remain blissfully unconscious of their duties toward it. They know only those of its functions that are of material benefit to them, the surgery, the chemist's shop, the end of the post-office counter, or those which they are compelled to use, such as the schools. They are living in yesterday, looking for the largesse of overlords whose disappearance they have not noticed. Come at last into their kingdom, they regard themselves still as beneficiaries, not as rulers. The way is open that they should rule themselves, but only if they will carry the burden and anxiety of rule. The one thing the benevolent forgot to do, of which only grace could have been the remembrancer, was to seek the consent of men to be saved.

On the basis of this diagnosis, the social task of the Church is self-evident: it is to renew a right spirit in the Welfare State. We must ensure that its development is towards full democracy. It should be seen as ordained of God to the primitive diaconate of social service. Stephen and his colleagues were to administer distributive justice as between the Hebrew and Greek widows: their modern counterparts are concerned with a great nation more

closely committed than any other in history to the social principles of the first Church, which had all things in common.

On the administrative side, our own Church, being Established, can make a weighty contribution by example, if only her leaders will resist the facile attractions of the secular patterns. She should retain, and reform to strengthen, her traditional type of administration answering to her character, in which personality, independence and co-operation have play. The crux is the parson's freehold, and while seeking to amend its abuses, she should never forget the fatal flaw in any alternative. The Guild Churches of the City of London are as a cloud no bigger than a bishop's hand. In a highly planned society the Church must have her own central organs, and these should be genuinely responsible ones preserving the present invaluable devolution of authority. We should be wary of the power accruing to the Bishops' Meeting, now become an institution whose history is remarkably similar to that of the Cabinet, except that its members answer to none and cannot be dismissed, and which, having passed through the eighteenth-century phase, is emerging as a formidable extra-constitutional authority in our Church. On the other hand, a constitutional episcopacy such as some dioceses enjoy gives us a most excellent instrument of government, combining the aristocratic and democratic principles.

There should be co-operation with Local Government and encouragement of voluntary organizations, for these can be forts of liberty and variety stemming the onslaught of totalitarian administration. Clergy, and laity representing their Church, should readily accept co-optation to Local Government and other committees, bringing a disinterested voice and helping to measure proposals by the standards of the Gospel. Each parish should foster its own schools, clubs and societies and recruit members of the congregation to serve the secular voluntary bodies. It is an irony that in the Welfare State these last are as necessary as ever, particularly for youth, old people and adult education, but to-day they will not be so much pioneering ventures as junior yet independent partners with the statutory organizations. The English community has always found free expression and spontaneous cohesion in voluntary associations, which make up a Fifth Estate as important as Parliament or the Press for the preservation of our liberties.

Yet the main task of the Church is still her ancient and primary one, to preach and teach the Gospel that individual men and women may awake to be persons and grow into the stature of Christ. The heart of the danger threatened by the Welfare State

is political and spiritual, that it may soon consolidate into a benevolent despotism because the mass of its people are indifferent towards it, citizens only by name on a voters' list. The task is to recreate an aristocracy, not of purse but of soul, to mediate the Holy Spirit that men may be priests and kings. The Christian aristocrat is moved also by *noblesse oblige*, having at heart not only the needs but the dignity of others. He knows that liberty will thrive where each is concerned to defend the other man's freedom. He reveres the Commonwealth, acknowledging its ranks and degrees, but does not bow before it, valuing an ordered society as the condition of personal life. He knows from both his Testaments the rightful place of law as a means to spiritual growth. He reverences excellence, prizing truth and beauty for their own sakes. Above all, fearing God, he fears no one else and treasures a point of reference beyond this world by which he may judge men and their institutions, and if needs be defy them. He is independent, in Church and State, in the aristocratic sense that his final loyalty is to the best wherever he find it. His care for the State is for a society of men like himself, and his care for them derives from God's love of him, so that the State and all men, with himself, are subject to an external and supreme authority. Only when the aristocratic principle is present in strength can there be government by consent, because only then can there be independent judgment of the doings of governments based on an appreciation of verities above both ruler and ruled.

Given such a revival of personal Christian purpose, the structure and methods of the Welfare State would change in response. As things are, it is astonishing how much can be amended by individual vigour, and in fields stonier than Crichel Down. The difficulties of renewing government by consent in an industrialized society are great; Russian Communism proceeds from the conclusion that they are insuperable; but in Britain we are comparatively well placed. For all their apathy and ignorance our people are the most politically adult in the world. In a just war, when the aim of government is simple, consent is all but unanimous, and whilst devoted yet also critical. We have an intense national loyalty, focused in the Crown and, strangely, still to some degree in the Church. We are ready to die for the Realm of England; we have to learn to live and work for the Welfare State of England.

If the Gospel is to be preached in terms efficacious for our day, then there must be a general return to theology. It is not now a question of finding the 'social application' of the Gospel: things have gone too far: but rather of searching afresh the meaning of the Gospel itself. The need is for a radical review and re-creation

of the theology of the grace of God. The Church has to rediscover the character of authority in a Christian society and to re-state the nature of charity now that the poor are not so much with us, tracing again the foundations of the City of God. She will find her patterns in the prophetic view of law and in the Divine condescension and love, observing that, in Old and New Testaments alike, these do not dwarf nor distort independent personality but are the conditions and nutriment of its growth. 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet and I will speak to thee'. The immensity of the difficulty lies in the gulf between the received Christianity of the Church and the truths of our time. The same forces of history and science that have blasted open that gulf, sweeping away all but the bare essentials of the faith, are the very forces that have brought the Welfare State into being and gone far to destroy the social cement of tradition, respect and sense of belonging that once held society together. Our theology has to come to terms with history and science before those disciplines will come to terms with the grace of God. Therefore, in this central task of the Church the Modernist has a crucial place. Only if he, by prayer and thought and with the courage of a Barnes, can now elaborate his theology and, in the strength of love, persuade the Church of it, can that Church be equipped to meet the need of the State. The alternatives are those evasions of history and science and of social responsibility — Semi-Barthianism, Neo-Orthodoxy, Fundamentalism — rationalizations of intellectual timidity that have separated if not yet divorced the Church from her people. There is to be deprecated a recent tendency to present Modernism as only liberalism of outlook; the demand upon us is too grave for any such comfortable an accommodation. When a party, in Church or State, begins to claim the pre-eminence in liberalism and tolerance, it is because it is dying and has no other claim on our attention, as witness the last throes of the Liberal Party.

A theology of grace, rooted in experience and fortified by learning, will dictate the strategy of the Church within the Welfare State as one of inclusion, not exclusion. The desperate need of the State requires, as a right theology demands, that we regard every citizen as possessed of a natural knowledge of God and blessed by prevenient grace, so that, like the Prodigal, he can come to himself. The tactics must be to strengthen the inner Church group of convinced and worshipping persons, and through them to move outward to ever wider circles, couching the Christian message in accordance with the capacity to respond. We must take with us the multitude of God-fearers, nor despise the support of the greater and ignorant multitude moved only by a vague goodwill,

if we hope seriously to influence the direction the State shall follow. We must learn to combine a devotion to Christian standards with equal devotion to men and women who, like ourselves, have fallen short of them, and avoid confounding those standards with rigorist legalism that pinpoints a particular failing because it happens to be readily detectable. Never could it have been more foolish than now, when we must win back 80 per cent. of our people, so to interpret and apply the Christian standard of marriage that we virtually excommunicate sixty thousand persons a year and lose all contact with their children. The charity of the Church and the needs of the State must both condemn such folly. We should recall with humility and pride that we are the Catholic Church, not a sect, and mould ourselves not on the Montanists and Brownists, but on the Synod of Rome in its dealing with the lapsed and on the first Elizabeth in her treatment of the proto-Puritans and the recusants. The Acts of Occasional Conformity were ones of Christian statesmanship. Our temper and approach must be, not that of the proposed Canons, but of the admirable statement on the duties of the laity issued at the end of the war.

A Church grown out of touch with her society, intellectually suspect, and regarded with indifference by the mass of men, is always tempted to retreat to the catacombs, there to make her own ever narrower life. The reply of the Catholic Church, after recollecting herself, has always been to advance from the catacombs, as in the beginning she took her message from the back-street upper room to the world at large. Our Church, above all others, should understand this, having Hooker for her mentor. We cannot have ease again until once more the Church of England and the Commonwealth are one and a man by virtue of his citizenship a member of Christ's flock. There is no other answer to the threat of tyranny latent in the Welfare State than that the bulk of our people should be professing Christians. Upon the outcome of our mission depends the survival of our Church, but also the chance that our people shall remain English.

'RE-MYTHOLOGIZATION': THE GOSPEL IN CONTEMPORARY TERMS

By the Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford and Tutor of Ripon Hall

DURING the period which elapsed between the two world wars the problems raised by the Theological Liberals were shelved. They were not solved; and, because they were not solved, they have re-emerged in a slightly different form. There are two melancholy consequences: firstly, the presence in our congregations of a substantial proportion of regular worshippers who do not really believe what, rightly or wrongly, they think they ought to believe; and, secondly, the absence from our parish churches of a vastly greater number who ought to be present, and who would in many cases be present if the Church had been more effective in the proclamation of the Gospel.

In the course of the last war Professor Rudolf Bultmann of Marburg, moved by a most praiseworthy concern for evangelism, wrote a challenging article entitled 'New Testament and Mythology: the task of demythologizing the New Testament', which was circulated among a number of German theologians and published in book form, together with their replies, in 1948. An English translation by Professor R. H. Fuller, omitting some of the replies, was published in 1953. In his original article Bultmann maintained that in the New Testament the Saving Acts of God are proclaimed in a form which presupposes a mythological conception of the universe derived from Apocalyptic and Gnostic sources, a conception which is not peculiar to Christianity, but represents the thought of a bygone age not yet transformed by natural science. He avers that the true challenge of Christianity has been obscured by the false challenge of an outdated view of the world. He therefore proposes to demythologize Christianity and to restate it in contemporary terms, by which he means in terms of existentialist philosophy. He wishes to speak not in metaphysical or cosmological language, but in terms of the actual decisions of human life. 'To believe in the cross of Christ,' he says, 'does not mean to look to a mythical event which has been fulfilled apart from ourselves and our world . . . it means, to accept the cross of Christ as our own, to let ourselves be crucified with Christ.'

At this point I suggest that we should take our leave of Professor Bultmann. He is dealing with a vital problem, and we must be grateful to him for stating the question in such trenchant terms.

But he is concerned with a particular form which the problem has assumed in Germany, the clash between Lutheran Theology and Existentialist Philosophy. The Church of England, though it owes much to the Reformation, is not Lutheran, and the inhabitants of our cities and of our villages, for whom our Church has a responsibility, are most certainly not existentialist philosophers. It will be more profitable to address ourselves to the problem as it faces us here in England, instead of to a particular form which it assumed half a generation ago in Germany.

In England, as elsewhere, the problem is not purely theological. A human being is not merely intellectual, and Christianity is not solely a matter of adhering to correct doctrines. A human being is a person who loves and hates, who works and plays in addition to thinking and believing. Christianity is a life to be lived and not merely a body of theological tenets to be accepted; it is a positive, loving response to God in every sphere of life. We in the Modern Churchmen's Union have always attempted to combine firmness with flexibility, to stand firmly by the principles of the Church of England in doctrine, liturgy and morality, but to display all necessary flexibility in presenting and applying them in a rapidly changing world. We welcome all signs of flexibility combined with firmness in every sphere of Church life. Some Churchmen are far too rigid in their theology, but show a refreshing and creative flexibility in their pastoral technique. We deprecate their doctrinal rigidity; indeed, we should be failing in our duty as we see it if we did not do so. But we can applaud their fruitful application of new pastoral methods. In particular, I should like to mention the inspiring work of the Rev. G. E. Reindorp at St. Stephen's, Westminster, the application of the 'house-church' technique in Leeds, and the activities of the Parish and People Movement. Their pastoral progressiveness is to be admired, although in some instances their theological rigidity is to be deplored.

The training of clergy is a sphere in which improvement and reform have long been overdue and are now proceeding rapidly. If a man is being prepared for work in the Church overseas, he is naturally instructed in the language, customs and thought of the people among whom he is to work. It is foolish to train ordinands only in the thought of the Bible and of the Early Church if they are deficient in their knowledge of the contemporary world. Since the war, intending clergy are sometimes sent to work in factories to gain experience of ordinary life. There has never, of course, been any official link between Ripon Hall and the Modern Churchmen's Union, but there has always been a strong personal link

and a similarity of outlook, although Ripon Hall does not consist solely of 'liberal' students, since it is more fruitful for students of different views to live and work together and to learn from each other. At the present time the link between the Hall and the Union is strong, and I am confident that it will be maintained. In this modernization of the pastoral training of clergy Ripon Hall is playing no small part, thanks largely to the generous support and assistance of the Church as a whole, and in particular of the Diocese of Oxford. In the Long Vacation Term which ended last week the Hall received valuable help from Canon H. C. Warner, Education Secretary of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council, and from the Rev. A. J. Watts, General Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Oxford. Owing in part to such assistance, rendered in some cases by men who do not personally agree with all that it stands for, Ripon Hall has every prospect of being able to make its distinctive contribution within the framework of the Church of England.

In this morning's paper, however, we are concerned with Theology, and I have ventured into other fields only because Theology is apt to become lifeless if detached from worship or from daily life. Against this wider background we must examine more closely the problem of demythologization. By the word 'mythology' Bultmann means the use of imagery to express the other-worldly in terms of this world. He does not employ the word to mean 'ideology' or 'mental framework'; in that case he would merely be advocating a change from a first century to a twentieth-century mythology. It is not, however, possible to avoid the use of imagery to express the other-worldly in terms of this world. If we speak of God as Father, we do not mean that He is a father in the ordinary sense of the term; hence the word 'father' is a piece of this-worldly imagery describing God, who is not limited to this world. What Bultmann means is that we must be careful in our choice of imagery, paying close attention to the familiarity of our metaphors and to their associations. It follows that different sets of images must be employed when we are preaching the Gospel to different types of people. St. Paul's phrase, 'All things to all men', has acquired a bad sense, suggesting a lack of sincerity. We must restore to it the true meaning which it bore for St. Paul himself. It was clear, for example, even before Billy Graham's recent visit to this country, that a not inconsiderable minority of the people of this country are capable of responding to an effective presentation of old-fashioned evangelicalism. It is equally clear that the majority will always be deaf to any appeal of this kind. It is not my intention to say anything about

either the merits or the limitations of the Graham technique. It is a method which works well with some sections of the population. We need other methods which will be at least as effective as Billy Graham's among those for whom he has no message. The distinction which I have attempted to draw between the different presentations of Christianity which may be necessary for different types of people must not be confused with the distinction between the academic study of dogmatics on the one hand, and popular presentations on the other. Dogmatics is the study of doctrine and is not to be identified wtih Biblical or Patristic scholarship, although it ought to be heavily indebted to them both. We must continually rethink what we ourselves who are Christians really mean by our Christian assertions, and this dogmatic rethinking must proceed *pari passu* with a rethinking of the manner in which we present our doctrine to those who do not profess and call themselves Christians.

In both these spheres we must avoid the pitfall of reductionism. If a man does not accept Christianity, it may be only because he does not understand it. In many cases people are not Christians partly because they do not understand Christianity and partly because, even if they did understand it, they would still reject it. For example, when I say that I believe in God I do not mean only that I have a special attitude to life; to say that would be to fall into the error of reductionism. The fact that I have a certain attitude to life is one of the results of my belief in God. If I try to express Christianity in terms which a non-Christian will both understand and accept, I may end by saying something which is not Christian. Two people who disagree may be

(*a*) saying the same thing in different terms
(*b*) saying different things in different terms or
(*c*) saying different things in the same terms.

In other words, the disagreement may be due to a difference in language or it may be due to a difference in belief. We ought to meet the non-believer half-way by adopting, as far as possible, his own language, but we shall be failing him and false to God if we unwittingly adopt beliefs which are not Christian. In particular, when we speak about God we are speaking about One who exists. The word 'God' is not one which we employ to describe only our own attitudes or our own decisions.

But our difficulties are not over when we say that we must reinterpret all that is essential to Christianity in a contemporary mental framework. In the first place, there is no single mental framework common to all our contemporaries. In the second place, Christian

truth can no more be fitted into some twentieth-century mental framework than a six-foot man can be fitted with comfort into a five-foot bed. The false belief that nothing exists but matter is for many people a presupposition which is unquestioned and is part of what I have called their mental framework, and of course it excludes belief in God. It is not possible to express truth in terms of a mental framework which is basically false.

It is, of course, possible to express part of the Christian truth in terms of a mental framework which is false as a whole, provided that it is not false in all its parts. We may take as an example the doctrine that men are made in God's image, but fallen. This doctrine of Original Sin must be distinguished from the doctrine of Original Guilt which, in its more ferocious popular forms, teaches that God punishes us for the sin committed by Adam in virtue of some principle of seminal identity or legalistic imputation. This doctrine of Original Guilt should not be reinterpreted in any way at all : it should be rejected out of hand ! The doctrine of Original Sin, on the other hand, maintains that we are in fact sinful because of the sin of Adam. The truth which lies behind this picture-language is that there is in fact evil in all men, evil due not to the conscious sins of individuals, which is actual sin, but to our heredity and our environment, especially to our social environment. If, for example, a man's character is warped by cruelty in childhood and he becomes embittered, there is a residue of evil in him for which he is not personally responsible. It is evil of such a nature as this that can be referred to as original sin. Even an agnostic can understand what is meant by this partial reinterpretation of the traditional doctrine, but he cannot be aware of the significance of sin if he does not believe in God.

It is at this point that Bultmann's contribution becomes relevant. What he has done is to substitute for the traditional doctrines some of their practical corollaries. For example, in his theology the Resurrection of Christ means that the doctrine of the Cross, as he himself has reinterpreted it, is true. Now this is one of the consequences of belief in the Resurrection, but the Resurrection means far more. We have suggested that one reason why non-Christians do not accept our doctrine is that they lack the religion of which the doctrine is a conceptualization. We must present the practical consequences of a doctrine, not as a substitute for the doctrine, which is what Bultmann appears to have done, but as a means of making the doctrine live.

The doctrine about which enquirers seem to ask most questions is the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. They are not concerned about such technical terms as nature, person or substance, but with

the vital matters of which the doctrines stated in these terms are an expression couched in the language and thought-forms of the fourth and fifth centuries. Men ask, 'What is the purpose of life, and what is our destiny?' The Christian answer is that our destiny depends upon God, and that in Jesus Christ God has made available for us both knowledge and power.

Before we can attempt to express this doctrine in terms which will present a true challenge to the men of our own day, and compel them to accept it or to reject it for the right reasons, we must remind ourselves how it was expressed in the first century and in the fourth century. According to the Nicene Creed, 'Jesus Christ . . . being of one substance with the Father . . . was made man'. The New Testament does not, of course, entirely eschew such language, but since its background is mainly, though not exclusively, Hebraic rather than Hellenistic, it speaks for the most part in practical and ethical rather than in metaphysical terms; it is concerned with what God has done, is doing and will do rather than with His eternal nature. In the Epistle to the Romans we read, 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (*Romans* x, 13). Now it is clear from the context that by the term 'Lord' St. Paul means Christ. But in *Joel* ii, 32, the Old Testament origin of the quotation, it refers to God. In fact, Christ is the practical equivalent of God. St. Paul's writings include other passages of similar import. In II *Thessalonians* i, 9, he speaks of Christ in language borrowed from *Isaiah* ii, 9, in the same way, I *Corinthians* ii, 16, reflects *Isaiah* xl, 13, and I *Corinthians* x, 21, appears to reflect *Malachi* i, 7. In these passages St. Paul does not assert a substantial unity of God and Christ: he suggests a practical equivalence by applying to Christ words which in the Old Testament were applied to God.

There are other statements in the New Testament which lead us to suppose that the first Christians tended to view the relation between God and Christ in functional rather than in metaphysical terms. In the Old Testament the phrase Son of God is applied to Israel as a whole by Hosea when he says, 'When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt' (*Hosea* xi, 1, cf. *Exodus* iv, 22). It is also applied to the king of Israel, who summed up in his own person the entire nation (II *Samuel* vii, 14), and to any righteous Israelite (*Wisdom* ii, 18). The Son of God, then, in the Old Testament is a person or the nation who fulfils the purpose and the will of God. The first Christians who used the term of Christ presumably meant that He fulfilled perfectly the will of God which had been fulfilled in part by the people

of God and their leaders in the Old Testament. In *Isaiah* the term 'Servant of the Lord' is applied apparently to Cyrus, to Israel and to the righteous in Israel. It is so fluid that it may be regarded as the personification of a function. The New Testament writers did not err when they thought that the function personified by the Servant of the Lord had been fulfilled perfectly by Christ alone, even though Deutero-Isaiah did not in the popular sense foresee Christ. These few instances must suffice as examples to illustrate the fact that the New Testament speaks of Christ mainly in functional terms.

Yet the New Testament does not speak of Christ only as the Messiah, or Son of Man, who is God's agent for the inauguration of the new age, though this concept is the most frequent. St. Paul writes of 'One Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him' (I *Corinthians* viii, 6). Normally St. Paul thinks of Christ as God's agent in the new creation. In this passage, as in *Colossians* i, 15 ff, he says that Christ had also been God's agent in the original creation. It is clear that St. Paul was not primarily interested in cosmogony for its own sake, but for the sake of its practical religious consequences. In I *Corinthians* viii, 6, St. Paul uses the theory that Christ was God's agent in creation to show that all meats are in themselves legitimate for a Christian, although for reasons of charity it may be right to abstain. The same point is adumbrated in I *Corinthians* x, 25, if 'Lord' here refers to Christ and not to God. In *Colossians* St. Paul draws from the doctrine of creation through Christ the practical religious consequence that the Colossians ought not to worship principalities and powers. The point at issue is this: Is Christ only a temporary and partial revelation of God, or is He a complete revelation of all that God has done? Are there areas of human life, represented by the principalities and powers, in which the revelation through Christ is not relevant, or do we find in Christ knowledge and power which ought to be our guide and our stay in every field of human life? One practical religious consequence of the doctrine of creation through Christ is that Christ is the key to the understanding of all that exists. It is not, of course, to be supposed that a doctrine means nothing more than its practical religious consequences. We are not justified in substituting for a doctrine the sum of its consequences.

I would suggest, then, that the New Testament writers thought of Christ mainly in functional terms, and that they speak of Him most frequently as God's agent in the New Creation, although in a minority of passages He is also regarded as God's agent in the original creation. Such views were natural among Christians of

the first generation, since their background was Jewish, being based upon the Septuagint. To them the important questions about anything was not, 'What is it?' but 'What does it do?' About Christ they asked, 'What is His work?' and the answer was, 'The work of Christ is the complete work of God', which meant that they viewed the relation between God and Christ as one of practical equivalence. The theologians of the Patristic period, on the other hand, were concerned with being rather than with doing, with nature rather than with function. They would have accepted the dictum 'operari sequitur esse', whereas the corresponding dictum which seems to be presupposed in the New Testament would be 'esse est operari', 'a thing is what it does'. The New Testament writers, presupposing the mental framework in which 'a thing is what it does', believed that Christ's work is God's work. The Patristic theologians had to do justice to this belief in terms of the mental framework in which 'operari sequitur esse'. Under these circumstances it is hardly surprising that St. Athanasius believed Christ to be of one substance with the Father. No one would claim that this formula does justice to the mystery of the Incarnation, but it is hard to see how it could be bettered in terms of the mental background within which St. Athanasius had to work, and which, of course, he accepted. Dissatisfaction with the Nicene formula is dissatisfaction less with what it asserts than with the language in which it is expressed. In substance it goes beyond the typical New Testament assertion that Christ is God's agent for the inauguration of the Messianic age, but it is doubtful whether in respect of content it goes beyond the implications of the New Testament passages which associate Christ with God in creation and in the future judgment, or which speak of Him as seated at God's right hand. The Nicene doctrine is stated in terms of being, whereas functional modes of expression predominate in the New Testament, although the language of being which is typical of the fourth and of the fifth centuries is to a great extent anticipated in the prologue of St. John's Gospel and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

This 'acute hellenization', as a result of which New Testament Christianity was developed and restated in Greek thought-forms, was desirable and, indeed, inevitable. It seems clear that restatement in contemporary terms is long overdue. The difficulty has already been mentioned; there is in our own day no one system of thought which can play the part played by the Greek thought of the fourth century. The Dean of St. Paul's, in his book entitled *The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century*, has sketched in the outline of a possible restatement in terms of psychology and

parapsychology. This book was, of course, intended not to propound the solution, but to point out a possible line of approach. A great amount of work on this and other lines must be undertaken before any solution is in sight. I do not intend on this occasion either to pursue the line indicated by Dr. Matthews or to propose an alternative. I wish only to register a plea that in the meanwhile we should lay stress upon the practical religious consequences of the Incarnation, in spite of the fact that they do not in themselves constitute an adequate restatement.

How then can we make real to an educated agnostic the practical religious consequences of the belief that God created the world through One who was later incarnate as Jesus Christ? I assume that the agnostic does not believe that there is any divine purpose for the world or for the human race, and that he seeks to realize in his own life such limited purposes as may be possible for him. He may say, 'I do not know where we came from or where we are going, but since I am alive I will try to make life as full and as satisfying as I can, both for others and for myself'. What can such a man say about Jesus Christ? He may regard our Lord as a noble and heroic teacher, as a great idealist, though possibly not very practical, as one who did His best, but was swimming against the tide, not as one who forwarded the purposes for which the world exists and which must finally be realized, whether on this planet or in some other state or being. At this point the difference between the Christian and the agnostic concerns the world just as much as it concerns Jesus Christ. The Christian believes that there is a reason for the existence of the world, and that one of the purposes for which the world exists is that human beings endowed with freedom of will may grow more fit for fellowship with God and with each other by responding freely to God. He believes that knowledge of God and the influence of God are made available for us in Jesus Christ. He believes that man's highest good is not just to make the best of things during his brief span of life in a world which is indifferent to his fate, but to submit himself to the God who is made known to him in Christ. He believes that this highest good of man is not a mirage, not merely a wish-fulfilment projected on to the clouds, but a good which can be attained, though not completely in this life, because it is the will of God who created all that exists and who has revealed Himself supremely in Jesus Christ as the God of love.

MARRIAGE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. E. L. Carpenter, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Canon of Westminster

IT would be difficult to imagine a work of greater super-erogation than that which I have undertaken this morning, were it even that of taking coals to Newcastle, gaiters to a newly appointed archdeacon, uplift to Modern Churchmen, or eloquence to a meeting of Convocation. The Attitude of the Anglican Church to marriage—what it has been, what it is, what it ought to be—these have been debated *ad nauseam*, have been the subject of conferences innumerable, have encouraged inferior clergy to slip away unseen from their parishes for quiet get togethers in salubrious places; have agitated the minds of learned, and not so learned, dignitaries; and provided the Mothers' Union, or rather its leaders, with a battle cry.

Such discussion, though much of it has been rather barren and platitudinous, has at least served to show that on broad principles relating to Christian marriage there is, in fact, a large measure of agreement among Church people, and that it is only on the application of these principles that there is diversity of view and sometimes of practice. But the discussion has now entered another and more decisive phase, for if the Church of England were to suffer the misfortune of being saddled with the proposed set of new marriage canons then uniformity would be clamped down on diversity and all of us, willy nilly, would be required to toe the line.

True it is, that the average layman, for whom canon law might well be a branch of military science, will almost certainly be seduced into regarding the new canons, *in toto*, with the same respect as the lawyers showed those of 1603; but so far as the clergy are concerned the story may well be different.

I cannot honestly, however, in this paper, hope to add anything to what has already been said, nor even to shed fresh light on old problems. On the contrary, I am indeed nervous lest after the breadth and universal interest of the papers already given mine should appear to be stirring up the muddy waters of controversy to no purpose, and should encourage an ecclesiastical introversion which is positively unhealthy. My excuse for the pedestrian nature of what is to follow must be, first of all, that I was asked to talk on this subject, and a natural weakness of will led to my accepting the invitation: secondly, so I try to encourage myself, that there is sometimes a modicum of value in repeating old and obvious truths since it is the familiar which is most easily forgotten. Perhaps I may quote an example of what I mean which recently came my way.

On a summer afternoon—I use this unattractive adjective merely to indicate the time of the year—I strolled into the public gallery of the Church House for a meeting of the Assembly—or was it Convocation—when a discussion was taking place on the propriety, or otherwise, of holding a service of blessing—no, it ought not to be called a *service*, we were reminded—upon those who were marrying again after divorce. A dignitary, who must be nameless—I never discovered who it was, anyhow—suggested that such a service ought not to take place immediately after the marriage in the register's office : there should be an interval time, he said, to mark the Church's disapproval of the step which the couple were taking.

More than once, during the course of his contribution to the debate, our elevated friend used the phrase (I cannot imitate his sonorous and significant intonation) 'the mind of the Church'. And yet he ought to have known better, and I imagine that were it not for the excitement of debate, and the temptations of advocacy, would have known better. I could not but recall the sentiments of Parson Thwackum who expressed himself as follows : 'Now when I say religion I mean the Christian religion, and when I say the Christian religion I mean the Protestant religion, and when I say the Protestant religion I mean the Church of England'.

Our reverend gentleman, when referring in the particular context in which he employed the term, to the mind of the Church, ought in the name of fairness, and even of accuracy, to have added the qualification : 'When I use this expression, I ought not to be thought to refer to Lutherans, Presbyterians, Calvinists, or the Greek and the Russian Orthodox Churches; or the Episcopal Church of America. Nor, in respect of my own communion, must I include one branch of its long tradition, or a large number of my fellow and contemporary churchmen.'

It is, alas, true that phrases such as 'the mind of Christ', 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints', slip all too glibly from our tongues like glycerine down a patient's throat, and often the result, though we know it not, is to deify our own opinions, and to give them a degree of authority that they ought not to command.

But to return. In many respects the present marriage controversy, stimulated by the proposed canons, is, I fear, unfortunate, in that it tends to blur an effective witness to the Christian ideal of marriage just when it needs most to be asserted. Yet on the other hand, in fairness to all concerned, it is at least understandable that a discussion of this kind should evoke great emotional

fervour, since any controversy which relates to the life of the family, touches people at their most instinctive and affectional, sometimes emotional, levels—and when these people are Christians it penetrates the very nerve centres of the corpus of their beliefs.

Perhaps I may be allowed, though the subject is familiar, to spend a few moments elaborating this latter point, since it bears immediately, and significantly, upon the theme of this paper.

Any Christian sociology which seeks to base its teaching securely on fixed principles, must inevitably begin, I suggest, with the doctrine of the Trinity. This was the great truth to which Frederick Denison Maurice called his contemporaries in season and out of season, and which, incidentally, inspired his Christian Socialism. The Ground of all existence, its begetter and sustainer, is a Being whose Unity is not an isolated and unrelated numerical oneness. Rather it is a Person, who includes within Himself the richness of all possible relations. If we may so put it, God lives an intense family life : the love of the Father eternally begets the Son, which love returns dynamically through the Spirit, back to the burning fountain whence it came. The Unity of the Godhead is not simply metaphysical but moral. The tension of the One and the Many is in Him for ever resolved : there is no confusion of Persons; no blurring of real distinctions, but all is held together in a perfect love-inspired communion. To get down to what Bernard Shaw delighted to call tin-tacks, co-operation, not competition, is the law of all true and creative life.

Perhaps I may be allowed to quote from a letter which F. D. Maurice sent to his sister (on her birthday) :

> 'I have a great comfort in connecting your birthday with Trinity Sunday. It is to me the most sacred day of the year, the one which seems to me most significant, of universal blessings, and also one which blends most by strange and numberless links with my own individual experience and inward history. The idea of the Unity of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, as the basis of all Unity among men, as the groundwork of all human society, and of all thought as belonging to little children, and as the highest fruition of the saints in glory, has been haunting me for a longer time than I can look back to.' 'The Trinity,' he writes again, 'is the underground of all fellowship among men and angels . . . the ground upon which all things in heaven and earth rest, the centre around which they revolve.'

It follows, therefore, that to the Christian, personal relationships, and this applies with particular force to marriage, are the means through which we enter into the full and abundant life, and the pattern of their perfection is seen to have its Ground in the Being of God Himself.

Yet if the Doctrine of the Trinity points to the ultimate character of human relations, and to the final value of persons—to that which is referred to, I suggest, in such a phrase as 'not twain but one flesh,' meaning thereby that there are situations in which a human relationship is not accidental but has within itself the conditions of creative permanence — if, I repeat, the doctrine of the Trinity suggests these truths, a Christian sociology must necessarily move on to the further truth enshrined in Incarnation.

Here we see the eternal submitting itself to time and to the mutability which goes along with temporal succession, illustrating thereby that human relations or people are not to be thought of as Platonic forms, for ever perfect in themselves, which are yet brought together and contaminated by submission to a world moving in time. Quite the reverse. Personal relationships grow, sometimes they deteriorate, people become more, or less, mature, just because they live in a world of change. The relationship of marriage, for example, does not create an immediate and new metaphysical entity: as if some ideal Platonic form of marital union were projected into each couple as they knelt at the altar. Rather the relationship becomes itself by reason of its earthly pilgrimage, and by this very fact is forced to submit itself to a contingency which may turn out for better or for worse. I am of opinion, though it is clearly impossible for me to work out this thesis within the limits of a short paper, that the confusion between the ideal and the actual implicit in what is usually called the rigorist view, with the consequent treating of the one independently, or as if it were the other, comes from a theological failure to hold the tension between the twin doctrines of Trinity and Incarnation. Such confusion, or over simplification, makes legalism possible, because metaphysical entities, which do not need to justify or account for themselves in experience, can be treated as members of a class. Are we not back in the nominalist and realist controversy of the medieval schools?

But I have said enough, I hope, to suggest that a sensitive Christian sociology must give unique significance to the realm of the personal and therefore to marriage. This fact is writ large in the New Testament, where it is not accidental that when Christ talks of God it is to the life of the family that He turns. May I be forgiven if I say that Christ's approach is thoroughly existential. He assumes that those around him are already living as parents and as members of a family. They know how to give good gifts to their own children. Here, then, already to hand, is the raw stuff of a vital experience which enables them, in a measure, to enter into the life of God—or, to be more accurate, here is the

experience through which God is already entering *their* lives. We often talk of God as a father: perhaps it would be more in line with the realism of the New Testament if we said that fatherhood is like God: it gains both reality and significance from Him who reveals Himself, and His own nature, through these incarnational experiences.

Such thoughts make it abundantly clear that no Christian teaching can be indifferent to the life of the home and family, not because on its stability the mere existence of society depends, as Aristotle pointed out many years ago—though this is important and revealing—but because from its integrity, a creative individual and community life arises. Where family life is impoverished, it is not simply that symbols of fatherhood become impoverished too, but that resistances are set up to the mediation of God's love into the hearts of men. An iron curtain is introduced between earth and heaven.

Thus the instinct which seeks to discover, from the words of Jesus, teaching which bears specifically on the sanctity of the marriage relationship is, I am sure, a sound one. Nor is the endeavour to find in Him a final authority—though the nature of such an authority is, I believe, often misunderstood—other than a true one, because it represents a desire to see marriage, and its expression in home and family, not as one possible way of organising the social life, but as a divine and therefore a natural way. God must be present, we feel, in the strongest and most intimate of human experiences.

I am not concerned, this morning, however, with the endeavour to find what those specific words of Jesus were, but rather with the general tenor of His teaching.

What I think we may say, however, with a fair degree of confidence, from the general emphasis running through the Gospels, and also through the letters of Paul, is that Jesus placed unique emphasis on the relationship of marriage: that He saw it as God ordained, and finding its fulfilment, to quote the modern phrase, 'in the life-long union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all other'; that He regarded its stability not only as a social necessity, but as essential to the realization of man's many-sided nature. May we not add also, by reason of this very fact, that He regarded marriage as made for man, and not as a holy estate, independent of man, into which he entered. The angels are not given in marriage.

Such, by and large, under the guidance of the Spirit, Christians have taken His teaching to be. The Church wherever it has gone has tried to foster and to give stability to family life. It has used

metaphors taken from the vocabulary of the home in its common worship. Though Henry VIII did, in a crisis, petition the Pope for the luxury of two wives, Christians have consistently seen in monogamy the necessary condition of a creative and finally satisfying relationship within marriage.

But life does not always conform to the ideals which inspire us, and the difficulty across the ages has been how best to realize Christian standards of marriage in a world where human sin, folly and ignorance loom large; and where practice has often not only mocked the ideal but has served to obscure it. It is not in any way surprising, of course, that a relationship so *sui generis*, so intensely personal, should prove, just because it is so potent for good, so dynamic also in its release of evil. The great divide between what ought to be and what is has been apparent in this sphere all too often in the lives of Christian people. Hence the Church, faced with the stubborn problem of intractable human material, has been led to deal with it in a variety of ways, such diversity being in part due to differences of racial temperament, in part to differences of theological view.

For example, theologians in the East with their more volatile and subtle temperament were early prepared to recognize that if marriage as a life-long, love-inspired relationship was to be encouraged then certain deteriorations from it must be regarded as no longer capable of realizing this fruitful ideal. They saw the essence of marriage not as a contract which by its very nature could not be broken, but as a free moral relationship which sometimes, though rarely, could be destroyed by sin. Subject to certain disciplines—the Eastern does not to-day repeat exactly the same service—they were prepared to sanction remarriage after divorce.

The West with its more Roman and legal temperament tended to identify the ideal with the actual, and consequently treated the marriage contract as creating a relationship, which if entered upon in due form at the outset, could not later be rendered invalid. I cannot, in the short space of this paper enter into the theology which gave rise to this view, nor, may I add, is it easily discoverable, or always consistent when found. There were those, and there still are those, who regard marriage as creating a novel entity, a new creature, which by its very nature makes division impossible. A valid marriage establishes an absolute and basic structure which persists until death breaks it. An original marriage is, in fact, still in being if both parties are living, though one of them may enter into say three subsequent marriages. The atom may be split: but marriage is indestructable.

A view of this kind, sincerely held, and many do hold it

sincerely, defies, of course, the logic of any argument, and there is really very little to be said about it. A marriage estate, so conceived, has all the substantiality, I personally should say insubstantiality, which is given to an idea that has become altogether detached from its concrete, its existential, embodiment.

But though the Church in the West was led to profess its belief in the utter impossibility of breaking a valid marriage—a view to which many of us might assent if we could give a more lively significance to the defining adjective 'valid'—yet in practice its high theology was forced to give way. The same legalism, which at one moment affected to be absolutist, was called into assistance, and was able to discover that many so-called marriages had never really been valid marriages at all. As such they could be declared 'null and void' without infringing the indestructible nature of a real marriage. It is true to say, I think, that the Middle Ages suffered from excessive divorce, since a venal church, and sometimes an understanding or avaricious parish priest, found no difficulty in interpreting the laws relating to nullity to meet the needs of individual persons. Still, the Roman Catholic Church to-day allows itself a wide latitude in this respect.

The Reformation brought a new theological climate, in which the ecclesiastical Courts that operated in the Middle Ages became anathema in many countries. Most of the Continental Reformers—and may I here refer you to the small pamphlet published by the M.C.U.—were prepared to allow that sin could destroy the relationship of marriage: that permanency was not the only aspect of it which demanded witness. Divorce, so some theologians affirmed, was God's 'medicine' for sin. There were, they maintained, those who had lost the right of regarding themselves as within the privileged estate of marriage; they had, by their own sin, killed the growth which God's Providence would have nurtured.

It was natural that the stresses and strains of theological controversy, and social practice, which characterised the first years of the Reformation should have their repercussions within the *Ecclesia Anglicana* in the sixteenth century—a Church which by sheer necessity—it became a condition of survival—was forced to move towards comprehensiveness; a Church which, defying the logic of tidy and imprisoned minds, claimed to be both catholic and reformed; which in some aspects of its life continued to look back across the centuries to the past it had inherited; while in others it stretched out hands of fellowship to bold and intrepid reformers on the continent. We shall not be surprised, therefore, if we cannot discover any uniform teaching within the Church of

England since the Reformation concerning the indissoluble nature of the marriage tie.

It would be tedious, in a paper of this kind, to attempt to trace the differences of approach which have, in fact, found expression within the Church of England during the last 400 years. This task has been exhaustively undertaken by Dr. Winnett in a work which I hope S.P.C.K. will soon be in a position to publish.

In brief, it may be said that the Anglican Reformers tended to adopt the more moderate views of their continental brethren, though Cranmer—he always found it difficult to make up his mind—did so only after much hesitation. The death of Edward VI, however, prevented the enactment of the *Reformatio Legum*, which would have written the reformed view into the law of the Church of England. How far an open avowal of the legitimacy of divorce found expression in the sixteenth century courts is a matter of debate: what is certain is that the rigorist view was written into the Canons of 1603, under the influence of Archbishop Bancroft, a prelate who would have made an excellent head of police under a dictatorship.

As to Anglican divines during the seventeenth century, there existed great differences of view as to the attitude which ought to be taken to a marriage which had come to grief. Bishop Andrewes, John Howson and Thomas Comber held that marriage was absolutely indissoluble. John Reynolds, Bishop Hall and Herbert Thorndyke maintained that Christ plainly allowed divorce for the one cause of adultery, and that this must entail the right of remarriage in the case of the innocent party. Andrew Willet and Bishop Cosin were prepared to extend the grounds of divorce to desertion.

In the eighteenth century, bishops and clergy, by and large, when they ever thought about the subject, had no difficulty in recognizing the permissibility of divorce for adultery and the right to remarry, so much so that the Acts of Parliament which annulled marriages were passed only after a divorce *a mensa et thoro* had already been granted in an ecclesiastical court. I know of no episcopal protest against this. But such an expedient, of course, was the privilege of the rich. When in 1857 the Divorce Act was passed, one of the main drives behind it was the desire no longer to restrict the liberty of divorce only to those who could face the expensive machinery necessary to effect it. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner), the Bishop of London and several other bishops, supported this bill in the House of Lords. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford (Soapy Sam), and Kerr Hamilton of Salisbury opposed it on the familiar ground that marriage was

indissoluble; and others, who were not prepared to assert this extreme position, yet registered their dissent, because the Bill granted the liberty of remarriage to the guilty party.

A historical survey, such as we have very briefly given, presents nothing startling. It is in fact very much what we should expect if we are sensitive to the historical *ethos* of the Church of England. We find running throughout it, as a golden thread, an ultimate agreement as to what constitutes Christian marriage—an agreement which we may claim, reverently but with confidence, reflects the mind of Christ so far as it is given us to know it: but there is no common derivative theology in respect of it: no uniform way of handling the New Testament. The subject, we must remember, was not one which almost until this century aroused much controversy: the Reformers were at first more concerned to abolish ecclesiastical courts, though in doing so they maintained strongly the right of divorce. The Anglican bishops who in the eighteenth century were prepared to allow that divorce was sometimes the lesser of two evils were not unduly disturbed because the Canons of 1603 said the opposite. Divorces were few, and these only among a small social circle.

And here the matter might have rested were it not for new social and theological developments. The Divorce Act of 1857 made divorce possible by setting up a fairly simple machinery to effect it. The social and economic changes of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, by submitting the institution of marriage to new and exceptional strains, increased beyond possible anticipation those who wished to avail themselves of it. The reasons for this are not far to seek and everyone is familiar with them. In earlier days, though there was a great deal of sexual promiscuity, the marriage bond was willy nilly respected. Economic pressure kept husband and wife together: women had little scope outside the home and no legal rights: society was largely static. But in the nineteenth and still more in the twentieth century conditions drastically changed. The integrity of the village community was weakened as the industrialization of England went steadily forward. Men and women, herded together in great towns, were encouraged to lead anonymous lives. Two disastrous world wars led to hasty and ill advised marriages, and entailed long and anxious separations. Loss of religious faith, and a smattering of scientific knowledge, encouraged a break away from older standards and a belief that morality was largely subjective: the pace of living, and consequent nervous strain, made it more difficult to establish stable relationships.

Faced with a situation of this kind, it was natural that Churchmen should feel bound to ask questions. Was it not just the possibility of divorce which had lowered the status of marriage and thereby encouraged the view that it was a contract terminable at will? Ought not the Church to refuse to sanction any departure from the Christian ideal? Such thinking, which, I repeat, is understandable, also drew additional support from the rising church-consciousness which the Oxford Movement had fostered. To admit divorce was to bow before the new omni-competent State. The indissolubility of marriage was a God-given fact, and the Church could not depart one jot or tittle from the teaching of its Master. Thus though in 1909 Hensley Henson, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, was willing to recognize cruelty, habitual drunkenness and insanity as proper grounds for divorce, the Lambeth Conference of a year earlier had declared, by a small majority, the undesirability of marrying even the innocent party to a divorce in church. Such a view was given further official sanction by the Lambeth Conferences of 1930 and 1948, by the Church and Marriage (Majority) Report of 1935, and by the Convocation Resolutions arising out of that Report. Yet despite this, as we all know, the law of the land remains—that a divorced person is fully entitled to seek remarriage in church though no incumbent may be required to act against his conscience in solemnizing such a union.

Such then, in brief, is the present position, wherein the hardening of the official attitude of the Church is understandable. Indeed so far as this rigorist assertion has served as a protest against the alarming increase in the number of divorces, I think that most of us would admit that it has had value: it is when it asserts its point of view to the exclusion of all other, and seeks by majority votes in unrepresentative assemblies to dominate, that the story becomes a different one. Let it be said without hesitation. This absolutist view has never had a universally accepted theology to support it; nor is its basis in the Scriptures beyond dispute. Were it so, the orthodox churches of the East would be sunk in error, to say nothing of the reformed churches of Europe. Within the Church of England, it is true, the absolutist view has been consistently held, for a variety of reasons: but it has always been held along side of others.

The number of contemporary divorces is undoubtedly such as to cause grave concern, though we must remember that it is the prior breakdown of the marriage which is the real tragedy. Yet it does not necessarily follow that the sum total of evil would be less in our present day society if, by law, the possibility of divorce were precluded. Though too easy divorce may invite, even

encourage, the dissolution of marriage, it does not follow that a legally enforced life-long relationship would in practice secure greater happiness or more respect for marriage. The permanence of the marriage tie is not the only consideration to bear in mind. Marriage is a moral estate: it moves in the world, not of law, but of the personal: it realizes its nature in love. Just because it has within itself such vast possibilities of spiritual blessing, it can also manifest demonic and hideous evil. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* One wonders, in practice, what would happen if the State were to take some of our more enthusiastic and rigid Churchmen so seriously as to prohibit divorce altogether as an unnatural procedure, attempting the impossible. I am not at all certain that the resulting promiscuity would not be a thousand times worse. Is the sexual ethic any higher in Roman Catholic countries? I sometimes suspect that the rigorist view can only be put forward as a practical expedient because it is not likely to be tried.

In spite of what I have said, however, I am sufficiently illogical, perhaps I am enough of an Englishman, to maintain that the rigorist view has value, provided that it is contained within a wider and more resilient pattern. What is unfortunate is that it represents the view of a party at present dominant in the Church which is prepared, and even anxious, to enforce its will through legislative and consequent disciplinary action. Here is a situation to which we liberal churchmen cannot remain indifferent. What are we to do about it? I begin with three short preliminary observations.

First I must deplore, as one result of this situation, the tendency to force liberal churchmen into a position in which they are represented as championing more easy facilities for divorce, and as abandoning the ideal of Christian marriage. This is unfair and untrue; and it is imperative that those who hold that there are times when divorce is the lesser of two evils should affirm with no uncertain voice that it is just because they believe in the sacredness of the marriage tie, just because they do not wish in any way to weaken or impoverish it, that they take the stand that they do.

Secondly, we cannot be happy about a controversy which increases the weakness of the Church at a time when there should be a great and united effort to stand for those basic convictions on which all Christians are agreed.

Thirdly, the controversy is unfortunate in so far as it tends to divert Christian interest away from the over-riding need to understand the causes, sociological, psychological and spiritual, which lead to the breakdown of so many marriages.

From such observations, and from the historical sketch which

has preceded it, certain conclusions I think may be drawn, and it is to these, in conclusion, that I now turn.

I do not myself believe that the Anglican Church can honestly adopt such a uniform and clearly defined attitude to the marriage of divorced persons as the rigorists would wish to impose. It cannot do so, nor ought it to do so. It cannot do so because historically the Anglican Church, in respect of marriage, has not had in this connection either a common theology or a single view. There has been diversity ever since the Reformation. Nor am I prepared to allow that a uniform practice is here necessarily desirable, particularly when we remember the vast complexity of the human situation which lies behind the breakdown of a marriage. Every case is a special case. Of course, the easiest way out of a difficulty of this kind is always the legalistic way, because it ignores the subtle richness of the personal life and deals with people simply as members of a group. It assumes that the same thing is the same for everybody.

My own view, for what it is worth, is that the best working compromise would be the present legal situation if it were allowed to operate freely without episcopal pressure — that is, to leave a real discretionary power with the incumbent to marry or not to marry divorcees; that is, to take the law of the land as it now is and allow it to work freely. This seems to me the most simple, the most honest, and the most straightforward proceeding.

I realize, of course, that an immediate objection may be lodged against it in liberal circles — that such a procedure protects the conscience of the clergy but does not secure the same liberty for the laity. I realize and am very conscious of the force of this argument. But I would add that it would largely cease to be true if, I repeat, the clergy really did exercise their discretionary power and were not prevented from doing so by fear of episcopal disfavour.

Let me express my own personal position, the better to illustrate the point that I am making.

I do not accept the view that the taking of solemn vows in church creates between a man and a woman a link which nothing may subsequently destroy. I pray that it may do so: I do not believe that in the nature of the case it is so. I believe that violent and prolonged sin can and does, in certain cases, break such a union: so much so that divorce is not only permissible but sometimes desirable. A husband, whom I myself knew, returning from six years in the armed forces, found his wife non-existent. Diligent search discovered her in a provincial town where she has been living with a man for some five years, by whom she had had three

children. I took the view — she had no desire to return — that it would be morally wrong of the original husband not to divorce her : and I could see no subsequent reason whatever why he himself should not enter again into matrimony; particularly as it was no longer right that he should regard the woman he first married as his wife.

In taking the particular point of view that I do — a point of view, incidentally, which deplores easy divorce, and is desperately concerned to give to marriage permanence and dignity — I find myself in agreement with the Eastern Churches, with the Reformed Churches, and with a continuing tradition in my own Church. I cannot, self-critical as I ought to be, allow that this view is heretical or eccentric, though for the time being it has lost official support.

I recognize, however, that there are many clergy, perhaps a majority of clergy, though I do not think this is true of the laity, who do not share this point of view, either because they accept a different theological standpoint, or else because they are so alarmed with the vast increase in divorce that they feel the Church must set its face against it absolutely. I recognize that this standpoint has also its historic place within the Church of England. I have no desire to coerce such people to act against their conscience in this matter, though I do wish now and again that I could bring, at least some of them, to accept a different position.

But I, equally, have a conscience in this matter, and under the proposed canons I find that I shall be precluded from doing what in certain circumstances I should feel I ought to do. With all the humility that I can muster, and in the interests of the people I try to serve, I cannot honestly regard it as legitimate that my conscience should be over-ridden, and that I should be forced to act in accordance with principles which in fact I do not hold, particularly when my conscience in this matter is reinforced by so many and varying streams of Christian tradition. Is it to be wondered at that I, and many others like me, question not only the wisdom but the justice of coersive legislation in this field and ask whether it is being true to the best insights of the Church to which we all belong. I suspect that the aggressive attitude of the rigorist, and his unwillingness to make other than nominal concessions, is due to that contemporary craving for authority, and that flight from reason, which is one of the least attractive features of the age in which we live. Also, the mere existence of a Moral Welfare Council means that it must have a policy — and a policy must be uniform.

I believe therefore that it would be in the interest of all concerned, rigorists and liberals alike, that the M.C.U. should stand simply, charitably and definitely on the right of the individual incumbent to remarry, where he feels it his duty to do so; nor in this respect would I wish to limit his discretion to the innocent party. I am prepared to pay the average incumbent the compliment of believing that such liberty would not be followed by an orgy of marriages of divorced persons, but that this discretion would be used with restraint, common-sense and pastoral insight, as I believe was the case over a number of years in the diocese of Birmingham. Moreover, the fact that the rigorist and liberal positions were living together side by side would tend to prevent the worst excesses of both. The former would call attention to the permanence of marriage, and to the constant effort of will which is necessary to make it work: the latter to the possibility of a creatively new beginning where sin or folly have destroyed the old. The latter would constantly remind the former that taking such a stern view is indeed a serious and awful thing: the former would constantly challenge the latter with the truth that liberalism can easily degenerate into a too easy tolerance and finally to indifference. Might it not also be said of the liberal view which I have expounded that it will prevent the Church of England being exclusively committed to a theology which will not always work: and also will make it possible for the layman to feel that in a last resort he can get justice.

I am conscious at this moment of many omissions in my paper (I have not commented on the 'service of blessing'), but one in particular is deliberate. I have said nothing about the admission of divorced persons to Holy Communion because I do not regard this as a subject which it is really worth the while of thoughtful people to discuss — unless it is to secure action. There is something, to me, particularly nauseating in using the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to register disapproval and as a means of discipline: I find it difficult to conceal my indignation when I hear that this divorcee must not come to the Altar for three months, this one for six. If it were a matter of excluding him from the vicar's sermon for a similar period or even a year, I should take a less serious view of it, for reformation might well set in after what might prove a welcome reprieve. But the whole conception of the sacraments as rewards for right living, as the prerogative of those paragons of ecclesiastical virtue who keep all the rules, as a right that we earn through our good behaviour — this strikes me as assuming a very dubious theological position. We all come ill-prepared and unworthy to the Lord's Table — and we know it. I have not found

in my parochial experience that divorced people, who desire communion, are any more perfidious than their more fortunate brothers : and I am sure that those who are trying to take up the fragments of a broken life and to mend them as best they may, need all the grace which we believe they will find at the Table of the Lord. I could not dare to exclude them, for I am not the Host.

But my time is up. I have said nothing new, but I am conscious of having taken much too long to say it in. Yet mine are merely scattered thoughts to provoke your discussion. I hope that whatever the outcome, M.C.U. will play its part in helping the Church of England to serve the best interests of the people committed to its care. Not the least among these are those whose lives have been soured by personal tragedy where it hurts the most — in the home. More important than our rights and privileges as clergy is their welfare : I believe that the Ecclesia Anglicana, if it can remain true to its tradition of being unashamedly empirical, audaciously comprehensive and tantalisingly untidy, will be better able to deal with the rich diversities of their personal life.

But it will not retain this character unless we are active in preserving it.

CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MODERN WORLD

By Canon W. G. Fallows, M.A., Vicar and Rural Dean of Preston, Chaplain to Her Majesty the Queen

DEAN Inge used to remind us that the Gospels do not lead us to expect that there will ever be a large crowd at the narrow gate. 'Few there be that find it'. Nevertheless, the strategy of the Christian Church is to call all men unto Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and we measure our success, and more especially our failure, by the doubtful yardstick of Church membership and attendance at public worship. We forget that many are baptized by water who are not baptized by the Holy Spirit and that there are many baptized by the Holy Spirit who are not bathed by the waters of baptism. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth'. It is notoriously difficult in any age to assess the strength and effectiveness of the Christian religion. Open adherence to the Church is an unreliable guide. Ireland may be more God-fearing than England, but it does not follow that it is more God-loving.

The religious habits and opinions of our people, in so far as we can ascertain them, do not take us very far. The 'Puzzled People' of Peckham, as shown by the *Mass Observation Report* a decade ago, or the confused and tangled spiritual case histories investigated more recently by Rowntree and Lavers, recorded in their volume, *English Life and Leisure*, reveal an appalling state of muddle and spiritual insecurity. But it is really impossible to gauge the spiritual quality of life by a door-to-door canvass, be it ever so scientifically devised, or by those occasional, brief and subtle interviews in which the patient is unaware that his spiritual case history is being recorded. There may be more Christian living than Christian thinking. What Wordsworth called

> 'That best portion of a good man's life
> His little nameless unremembered acts
> Of kindness and of love,'.

is not measured by the social sciences and cannot but escape the most objective investigation.

In reaching a verdict in any enquiry into the quality and extent of Christian living in modern society, we must also beware of belittling the present because it is the present, and of seeing 'the glory, and the glamour and the gleam' in some supposedly golden age that has now gone by. Men are prone to that error more especially in religious judgment. The truth is, of course, that men have always thought like that. The gloomy observations on the

state of religion with which we have been familiar in our own time can be paralleled in almost every age. In the early years of the eighteenth century — to go no further back — William Whiston wrote words the sense of which has often been repeated from pulpit, press and platform in recent years: 'Anyone with a right sense of religion must be aware of its decay and disesteem in the world'. Daniel Defoe in the same period expressed a similar view: 'No age since the founding and forming of the Christian Church was ever like, in open avowed atheism, blasphemies and heresies, to the age we now live in.' And Dean Swift in his *Project for the Advancement of Religion* inspired, unwittingly perhaps, those more vituperative sermons which most of us preach at the outset of our ministerial careers.

> 'I suppose it will be granted,' Swift wrote, 'that hardly one in a hundred among our people of quality or gentry appears to act by any principle of religion; that great numbers of them do entirely discard it, and are ready to own their disbelief of all revelation in ordinary discourse. Nor is the case much better among the vulgar, especially in great towns.'

A hundred years later, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, the state of religion was at a still lower ebb. When Wesley and Simeon were dead and the evangelical revival had bloomed, there was still over most of the land a spiritual torpor and religious inertia. In parish after parish religious life was as stagnant as the parish church was decayed. It was not until the liberal reforms of the 1830's had overhauled the machinery and administration of the Church and checked the evils of pluralism and absenteeism, that there was any quickening zeal on a large scale. It is also important to remember that even the great heyday of Victorian church-going was also the period of William Booth's *Darkest England*.

These cursory historical reflections are needful and salutary when we deplore the state of religion to-day. They remind us how difficult it is to measure the penetration of Christian thought and ideals into the life of the people; they warn us against that apparently ineradicable pessimism (or is it Pharisaism?) that seems to possess most observers when they express their opinions about the state of other people's souls.

It would be equally folly, however, to turn a blind eye to the manifest evils and weaknesses of our time. The breakdown of Christian marriage standards, the high rate of illegitimate conceptions, the vast turnover of the gambling industry, the puerile and often sadistic condition of a section of the comic press — to name only a few of the disturbing features of the contemporary social scene — make a black picture. But even in these considerations

it is necessary to keep an historical perspective. We forget that the statistician whose figures are so often alarming is himself a modern creation and that we have no exact and comparable data for periods much earlier than our own. We speak too readily of a moral landslide. Menacing and disturbing as the situation may be, for instance in the question of sexual relationships, it is nothing like so bad as in the so-called ages of faith. The Middle Ages, when the Church was the power in the land, has a far seamier record than our own. This is not to minimize the gravity of the problem to-day or the peril in which our whole Christian culture stands if the standards of Christian life are weakened or altogether impugned. It is simply to plead for a sense of proportion in our judgment and to suggest that we need to look below the surface of the statistician's figures of broken homes, juvenile crimes, and any other evil condition of the times, if we are to understand the disease from which they spring and to discover and apply the needful remedy.

Our primary need is for compassion, sympathy and hope. Those who seek to bring Christ's healing touch to the modern world, to exorcise in His name and by His power the demons of this age, must first share His compassion and His hope. Boswell gives his opinion that the strength of Doctor Johnson's mind was shown in the fact 'that he would not inveigh against the present age, as so often happens when superficial minds are on the fret'. Nor shall we get to grips with our problems to-day if all that we can bring to bear upon them are superficial minds that are on the fret. We need a truly Christ-like sympathy with young people who have grown up during the war years and with the many in our industrial society who suffer from a real sense of frustration and boredom.

We must begin, then, with compassion, but compassion, like patriotism, is not enough. A compassion that is not armed by knowledge and a knowledge that is not fortified by experience will be of no avail in ministering to the sickness of our times.

Let us therefore approach the theme of our Conference this year with compassion and a desire to learn and grow in knowledge, and let us share that hope which Christ had in human personality. Perhaps our greatest need is a rebirth of Christian humanism.

> 'The Gospel,' as the Bishop of Southwell has put it, 'rehabilitated man. It set his life in the grand dimensions — the length and breadth and height and depth — of God's purpose for him in Jesus Christ. It lifted man to a dignity and status immeasurably and unimaginably higher than Sophocles or even Plato dreamt of, as the Child of God and the heir of eternal life.'

It is the lack of this sense of man's true dignity that is the root cause of our present discontents. Without it there is no ultimate sanction for morality and no sense of purpose for living. A man must hitch his waggon to a star if he is to find satisfaction in life.

Let us examine in this light one aspect of modern life. Week by week for most of the year eleven and a quarter million adults have their flutter on the football pools. This is the alchemy of our time. The ancients sought a stone that would turn all to gold; the moderns look for three draws, seven aways, or an all correct line in the penny points pool that will bring them a fortune. This modern alchemy embraces most social classes. Among the punters are charwomen and schoolmasters, stevedores and local government officials, barmaids and accountants, indeed a cross section of the community. Our modern alchemy involves no skill; fortune winners have confessed to the familiar device of the pin. Rowntree and Lavers expressed the view that this modern form of gambling is not in itself seriously harmful, and I would agree with that view. It is not so much wrong in itself as symptomatic of a sense of frustration and boredom in life.

The case of the football pools is but one illustration, chosen at random, out of many which seem to point to this conclusion. In the last fifty years great progress has been made in destroying the evil of poverty. We are left, however, with a poverty of mind and a poverty of spirit of which the vast extension of gambling is a sign. The question before us to-day is whether the Christian Church can inspire this comatose mentality with a life-giving sense of purpose.

There is no time now to develop the thesis that the only hope of bridging the gulf between the Christian religion and the mass of the people is through the liberal tradition, not because the liberal tradition is in itself all sufficing as because it has safeguarded the true humanism of the Christian gospel. Again, there is no time now to argue the case that belief in humanity will never long survive belief in God. Belief in God, in His moral law, in the Christian doctrine of man as the child of God and the heir of eternal life — these are the basic assumptions of a Christian culture. They are at once the pre-requisites and the safeguards of human freedom. Without them, as modern history shows, tyranny thrives; by them it is judged and condemned. This is the profession of faith to which we must hold fast and which we must make real for ourselves if we are to promote Christian living in modern society.

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS

The Editor being unable for the first time in his life to attend the Modern Churchmen's Annual Conference ventures to append an article which he contributed on the theme of the Conference a quarter of a century ago.[1]

ALTHOUGH the Church be *in* the world and not *of* the world, economic, social, and even political problems have always been with it—of course, more acutely in some ages than in others. We see that they entered into the teaching of Jesus Christ. He horrified His audience, who had been taught by the Old Testament to regard riches as a token of Divine favour, by saying: 'With what difficulty shall they who have riches enter into the Kingdom of God.' He bade His disciples lay up for themselves treasures in heaven, rather than treasures on earth. He exhorted them not to be anxious about worldly possessions, but to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all things necessary for this life would be added unto them. It is much disputed whether He taught that property should not be owned by sons of the Kingdom, or whether He taught that it should be counted of little worth in comparison with moral and spiritual possessions, and that poverty, far from being an evil, was a help rather than a hindrance to entrance into the Kingdom of God. I take the latter view because it is St. Paul's view, and I hold that St. Paul's ethical teaching reflects truly that of Jesus, whose slave he claimed to be.

The essentially Christian attitude towards material possessions is not, on normal occasions, that of St. Francis of Assisi to his bride Poverty, but that of the faithful and wise steward administering his Master's possessions. It is the sense of *stewardship*, not *ownership*, which marks the characteristically Christian relation to property. St. Paul spoke of himself as having nothing and yet possessing all things; it ought to be possible for a Christian to have all things and yet to possess nothing. God is the owner. This thought determines for the Christian the right use of property of every description. The amount that an individual owns—he may be a Rockefeller or a Crœsus—is not the Church's concern. It may be the State's concern, but that is another question. The Church's concern is the way in which he uses it. Is he acting as God's steward? That is the point in Clement of Alexandria's primitive Christian homily entitled, *Who is the Rich Man Who is Being Saved?*

[1] *Modern Problems of the Church.* By H. D. A. Major. (Cassell and Co., London, Toronto, Melbourne, Sydney. 1928.)

The Church's teaching should exhibit intelligence and moral fervour in stimulating this sense of stewardship, and in showing, as the need arises, how in all sorts of ways this stewardship may be exercised. The story in the Gospels of 'the fair deed,' of the alabaster box of ointment indicates that Christian stewardship has other functions than the relief of poverty. There is Christian education, Christian art, and, as we recognize also to-day, Christian recreation. By Christian we mean that which seeks the good of humanity in the deepest and widest sense.

In pressing the claims of this Christian stewardship of property in a Christian State, it should be done on the authority of Christian principles, and not in the spirit of a bureaucrat, or as the agent of a political party. The Christian steward of property is free to do what he thinks right with his property; what he does, he does as a free servant of Christ. The State compels; the Church persuades and points to an ideal. As soon as the Church allies itself to the policy of a political party in the State, it endangers its moral and spiritual influence. Though, at times, there be almost overwhelming temptations to adopt Cæsar's methods in the name of God, and in order that men may be made to render to God the things of God, yet when the Church does it, she forfeits something of her Christian character. The Christian minister is first and foremost God's steward, not Cæsar's slave, and in a Christian State, Cæsar himself desires to have it so.

These considerations do not prohibit the Church from being established and endowed by the State, provided the Church recognizes that its primary duty is to Christ—He is the supreme authority—and that the State is served not as a rival to Christ, still less as a superior to Christ, but in the name of Christ. In this case the Church is in a similar position to that of a Christian wife, or Christian son, or Christian servant, who obeys, it may be, husband, father, or master, not in opposition to Christ, but in the name of Christ. Christ counselled obedience to the State even when harsh. The words: 'If a man compel you to go with him one mile, go with him twain' (Mt. v. 41), refer to the right of the State official to impress men into the service of the State. Though the Church proclaims the Gospel of freedom, it is a freedom which is founded in obedience rather than in license. It is a freedom akin to that of which the Cavalier poet sings:

> 'Stone walls do not a prison make
> Nor iron bars a cage.'

It is not 'uncharted freedom,' the spirit of the revolted slave, the producer of selfish and insensate anarchy. The Christian religion stresses the inward, not the outward. So Christian free-

dom begins *within* : its throne is the human conscience and reason. Had the Christian Church been anxious rather to promote this freedom, than to secure for herself political power, how different would the world have been to-day. It is to the Christian religion that we owe the ideal *servire est regnare*. It was Jesus who taught : ' He that would be greatest among you, let him be your servant.'

The French Revolution stressed the ideals of freedom, brotherhood, and *equality*. The Christian Gospel knows nothing of equality, though freedom and brotherhood are among its watchwords. It is really sounder to base the rights of man on freedom and brotherhood, than on the fiction of equality. The Christian social ideal stresses not only freedom and brotherhood, but also subordination. It is a subordination which is truly free, because it is accepted by the will ; and it is essentially loving, for its ideal is to serve the brotherhood. The aim of the Christian Church should be to build up a human society in which freedom, brotherhood, and service are all combined, and where subordination is voluntarily accepted because it is not simply a needful condition for self-discipline, but because it contributes to the welfare of the whole society. It is this spirit, so wonderfully Christian in its consecration to disciplined and cheerful service for others, that we see reflected in *A Student in Arms*. It is this which was popularly called ' the spirit of the trenches.'

This is not the spirit of either the French revolution or the Russian revolution. Its motto is *Ich dien* : its ideal is to give rather than to get. If the Christian Church could make it the spirit of her members, the sickness that besets an acquisitive society, whether that society be capitalist or communist in its ownership of property, would be cured. The Church's duty is not to tie herself either to capitalism or to communism, to the dictatorship of the proletariat or to Fascismo, but to develop that spirit in the individual which will lead to the mitigation or even the elimination of the evils of these systems. Instead of seeking to make the world safe for democracy, or for aristocracy, or for plutocracy, the Church's aim should be rather to make democracy, aristocracy, and plutocracy safe for the world ; and that can only be by making the individual democrat or aristocrat or plutocrat a Christian in the sense which I have described.

Will this mean that the Church, in seeking first to achieve the Christian training of the individual, will not concern itself with industrial disputes, or factory conditions, or the housing problem, or the League of Nations, or a hundred other things that concern the social whole?

Certainly not; but she will regard them as secondary, not primary. The Church is primarily concerned with men, not measures. 'Awake, *thou* that sleepest, and Christ shall give *thee* light.' 'And she will strive to promote reforms as a task of Christian philanthropy—Christian service to humanity—not as part of a political programme. In other words, she will be very careful to act as the free servant of Christ, not as a political partizan. As in a regal and aristocratic society the Church became the ardent teacher of the duty of passive obedience and the right divine of kings to govern wrong, so there is now a great temptation to the Church in a social-democratic State to preach a facile popular gospel of the *panem et circenses* type—less work and higher wages, shorter hours and larger allowances—than the nobler and less popular gospel of daily service faithfully performed not for reward—a gospel so soundly expressed by that virile personality, Dr. L. P. Jacks, in his *Heroes of Smokeover:*

> 'The primary religious exercise for a Christian Man is to get the day's work done in the best manner it admits of. So far as this exercise is neglected all prayers become hollow, all sacraments profane, all doctrines false, and all churches foundationless' (p. 74).

A MODERN CHURCHMAN'S CREED

in the words of an Ancient Churchman

WE BELIEVE:

God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

God is Light, and if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

God is Love, and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

Jesus is the Son of God, and God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We are children of God, and He hath given us of His Spirit.

If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. *Amen.*

(Issued by The Modern Churchmen's Union)